THE Lutheran Quarterly

lume III AUGUST, 1951 Number 3

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume III AUGUST, 1951 Number 3

CONTENTS

JESUS, JOHN, PAUL ..... *Anton Fridrichsen* 243

LUTHER'S MUSICAL ACHIEVEMENT ..... *Robert Stevenson* 255

PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION. A STUDY OF RECENT TRENDS ..... *Carl J. Schindler* 263

THE SCRIPTURAL AND THEOLOGICAL BASIS OF EVANGELISM AND STEWARDSHIP ..... *T. A. Kantonen* 271

EPISCOPACY AND THE LUTHERAN CHURCH ..... Edgar S. Brown, Jr. 278

FIFTY YEARS OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY ..... *C. Umhau Wolf* 289

NOTES AND STUDIES

Luther's Teaching on Christian Responsibility in Politics and Public Life ..... *H. H. Kramm* 308

Reformation Research ..... *Harold J. Grimm* 313

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Wisloff, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (Oscar W. Carlson) 315

Baillie, *The Belief in Progress* (George Aus) 316

Kerr, *Positive Protestantism,* An Interpretation of the Gospel (Joseph Sittler) 317

Askmark, *Ämbetet i den Svenska Kyrkan* (C. G. Carlfelt) 318

Oxnam, *The Church and Contemporary Change* (P. H. Buehring) 319

Fleming, *Living as Comrades* (Paul J. Hoh) 321

Nixon, *Responsible Christianity* (T. A. Kantonen) 322

Knudson, *Basic Issues in Christian Thought* (Harold L. Creager) 323

Buttrick, *So We Believe, So We Pray* (J. Knudsen) 324

Bohlin, *Debatt Med Profan-Humanismen* (A. D. Mattson) 325

Karlström, *Ekumeniska Preludier* (Conrad Bergendoff) 326

Bokser, *The Legacy of Maimonides* (George W. Forell) 326

Swenson, *The Faith of a Scholar* (W. O. Doescher) 327

Knudsen and Mortensen, *The Danish-American Immigrant. Phases of his Religion and Culture* 328

Clark, *The Oxford Group: Its History and Significance* (T. G. Tappert) 328

Richardson (Ed.), *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (Eric H. Wahlstrom) 329

Smith, *The Physician Examines the Bible* (George E. Mendenhall) 329

Verkuyl, *Berkeley Version of the New Testament* (Jacob W. Heikkinen) 330

Cailliet and Blankenagel (trans.), *Pascal's Short Life of Christ* (William C. Berkemeyer) 331

Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (C. Umhau Wolf) 332

Kunze, *Die gottesdienstliche Schriftlesung* (John W. Doberstein) 334

Stubbings, *A Dictionary of Church Music* (George R. Seltzer) 334

Herzel, *More Than Bread* (Paul J. Hoh) 335

Ylvisaker, *Service Prayer Book* 335

CONTRIBUTORS 336

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
THE LIBRARY

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Office of Publication, Seminary Hill, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, Books for review to the Book Review Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
CONRAD BERGENDOFF
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

Managing Editor
THEODORE S. LIEFELD
Capital University Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Road, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Circulation Manager
ANDREW S. BURGESS
Luther Seminary, Como Ave. and Luther Place, St. Paul, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.
Harvey D. Hoover
Abdel Ross Wentz

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.
Paul J. Hoh
T. G. Tappert

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.
C. G. Carlfelt
Eric Wahlstrom

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO
E. C. Fendt

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.
Andrew S. Burgess

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA
Bernard Holm

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aims:* The aims of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Jesus, John, Paul[1]

ANTON FRIDRICHSEN

THE PROBLEM of *Jesus and Paul* for a long time was formulated in such a biased way as to lead to no fruitful results. The two were compared as religious personalities, and the "religion" of each set against the other. Did they have the same "religion"? "Jesus" became synonymous with the Sermon on the Mount and the parables, interpreted as a refined and reformed and spiritualized Judaism, a renewal and completion of the ethical monotheism of the great prophets of Israel. Comparing such a Jesus with Paul one could at best come to the conclusion that after all Paul had something in common with Jesus, that he had even caught something essential in Jesus, especially in his comprehension of love, the love of God, the love of Jesus, the commandment of love. But the dogmatic, the mythical, the gnostic in Paul had clouded and in many ways paralyzed this which in Jesus was simple and central. Paul was obviously a different religious type, a theologian and mystic who lived in the realm of the *pneuma* and therefore was not interested in and failed to appreciate the historical person of Jesus, indeed, did not care to know the historical Jesus. The words of Jesus played no part in his thinking nor did he build on them; instead, Paul formulated his own proclamation and doctrine out of other kinds of thinking and in another vocabulary. This whole interpretation, however, is guilty of two errors: it overlooks and denies the Messianic features in the person and work of Jesus, and seeks to put together on the same level Jesus the Messiah in his

1 A group of Swedish scholars published in 1948 *En Bok Om Bibeln* (A Book On The Bible). Among many valuable contributions was one on "Jesus, Johannes, Paulus" by Anton Fridrichsen. With consent of the author, a portion of this essay has been translated by the Editor for the readers of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. An introductory section on the historical phase of New Testament study has been omitted. In this issue the second part of the original article is presented—the third part, on John, will appear in the next issue.

historical situation and the apostle in his. But the two are incomparable. Instead of seeking to compare Jesus and Paul as religious types and personalities, we must study them *in their historical relationship to each other.* What is that relationship?

It is not that Paul was the disciple who was trained in the school of Jesus and then transmitted the teaching with his commentary. Paul was the apostle, who proclaimed the death and resurrection of the Messiah and interpreted these events and their consequences—the significance of the aeon. Were he disciple, transmitter, commentator, the question of criticism might be legitimate when it asks if his "religion" corresponded with that of Jesus. Then it might be of interest to make a psychological comparison of the structure of each and place them over against each other as religious personalities. But Paul is the apostle of Jesus Christ bearing the eschatological message of the crucified Messiah and of the reality of the resurrection, wherefore the critical problem must be differently stated. The question which then is relevant, scientific, and theological, concerns the manner in which Paul in his gospel and teaching fulfilled the intention of Jesus. Or did he dilute that message, or change the foundation on which Jesus stood, worked, taught, suffered and died? On the answer to that question everything depends.

If Paul's purpose in his preaching and teaching was to fulfil the intention of Jesus, then it is quite natural if he uses another terminology than Jesus himself who proclaimed the approach of the kingdom of God in an environment which was Jewish. Given Paul's situation and his mission it was both natural and necessary to build, not on the historical preaching of Jesus, but on the fact of the crucifixion and the resurrection, since it was his goal to develop what this fact implied. The analysis of Paul's "religious personality" and his "religion" in this connection has no particular bearing except as it may help to understand what he has written, his style, and his thought. A comparison between Jesus and Paul as religious personalities, preachers, and teachers may have value if one wishes to construct a gallery of "great religious personalities," a sort of entertaining spectacle, for the benefit of those who

like Alexander Severus are engaged in collecting a syncretistic pantheon in one's domestic shrine. When one isolates the great religious personalities from their historic milieu and inner context in order to place them beside each other on a common level, one gains at best only a very general religious phenomenology. It is without value when one seeks to understand a concrete historical situation such as concerns us here.

The teachings of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount and the parables, belong to his ministry among the ancient chosen people in the last days of the old era. In form and content they are shaped by this situation and its particular purpose—to prepare the congregation of the Jewish synagogue for the kingdom of God. They belong thus to the old aeon. But at the same time they carry within themselves the new. Thus they have been able to find a place in the church and there—in the light of the resurrection, in the congregation of the Spirit—become the Word of the Lord to his redeemed people. It was thus that Paul knew them and it is quite certain that he used them in the instruction of his churches. But he was not bound by them in his interpretation of the reality of the resurrection. His task was to make clear to Jews and Greeks what it means that the Messiah died and on the third day rose again according to the Scriptures.

To repeat, Paul was not the disciple of Jesus in the sense of one who transmits and interprets the Master's teaching. Still more—*Jesus never really had any such disciple.* This is a fact especially important and suggestive, a fact which better than anything else proves that Jesus preached not a form of religious wisdom, a doctrine of life or conduct, but brought news of what is now happening and what this demands. Matthew and Luke have preserved the Sermon on the Mount and the parables, not as teachings to be preserved and analyzed, but as an expression of the character and will of the heavenly Father. The word, the command, the simile, are not to be disassociated from the Jesus whose death reveals the fulness and glory of the Redeemer. Their application and truth are known only in the church which is one with Him through faith, Spirit, and sacrament. There is no difference in principle between the rela-

tionship of Matthew or Luke to Christ and that of Paul. The evangelists who record and preserve the Word of God, bear witness along with Paul that Jesus, the Son of Man, declared Himself Messiah, the Lord of the kingdom of God, the first born of a new generation, Saviour of the redeemed Israel. Paul is true to the intention of Jesus when he preaches Jesus Christ as crucified and risen and explains to Jew and Gentile what this means and what it demands.

Whoever heeds the watchword: Back to Jesus! will find himself further back than he foresaw. He will have to go back beyond Jesus to the synagogue. He stops at the Sermon on the Mount and the parables and thinks he is then in the company of Jesus. But even in the Sermon on the Mount and the parables Jesus is on the way to Calvary and the glory of the Father. The Messiah on the Mount was the Son of Man. If we do not realize this we get no farther than a Jewish interpretation of his words. Their form is determined by the historic context—the kingdom of God is at hand! But their inner meaning points to another context—The Lord is risen! And only in the latter context is their full import revealed. For the commandments of the Sermon on the Mount become an actual law of life and the parables yield their secrets only in the fellowship of the crucified and risen Lord.

Over everything that Paul says we can put the superscription "In Christ (ἐν χριστῷ). This is the token of the new era and will remain until it becomes superseded by "With Christ" (σὺν χριστῷ). He who believes the gospel of the crucified and risen Jesus, he is in Christ, he is a new creation, participating in that reality which came into being through the resurrection of Christ from the dead and which radiates from Him. Externally it is expressed by the incorporation of the believer in the congregation through baptism and by his presence in the sacramental unity of the congregation. This "in Christ" has its roots in faith and is inseparable from the church—its worship, ministries, and ordinances. Paul neither knows nor allows of any spiritualistic religion which the individual can nourish within his own experience or thought. Everything must be mediated by the church and have its place there. To be "in

Christ" is more than an idea or an ideal—it is a visible and tangible reality, by which the whole invisible reality of Christ enters into relationship with the believer.

In the history of the church Paul's mission was to establish and secure this understanding of the substance of Christianity—this, to be in Christ. He realized and illustrated the formula in his personal life. Our special problem here, however, concerns the historical facts of the early church, wherefore we seek to identify Paul's contribution to the understanding of what Christianity is. He created an interpretation of Christianity and gave it classical expression, at the same time as his missionary efforts founded the church in the centers of the cultural world of his time. We stand before his work with two questions—did Paul thereby carry out the intention of Jesus? and, where does Paul's "in Christ" belong in the history of ideas?

To the first question we can readily give an affirmative reply, since the fires of criticism have not been able to destroy the tradition which the Gospels convey of Jesus' description and consciousness of Himself. What we have learned about Jesus' calling Himself "the Son of Man" in His Messianic ministry has had decisive consequences for the problem of "Jesus and Paul." Especially the circumstance that we meet the idea of the church in the thinking, words, and deeds of Jesus Himself becomes the bridge between Himself and Paul, the establisher of the church. The Pauline "in Christ" is not something altogether new, springing from the apostle's personal experience. The Christ-relationship we meet in Paul is rather the realization of Jesus' idea of discipleship—a realization in the light of the resurrection and in a form dependent on it, and in a form, too, which certainly and quite naturally is affected by the religious individuality of the apostle. In regard to content there is a clear and indubitable connection between the Pauline idea of the church and the Son of Man's word about the Israel which he came to redeem, sanctify, and renew through his sacrifice.

In this connection the Lord's Supper is of unusual significance—apart from the Cross it is almost the only historical event which Paul mentions in his letters. It is hardly possible that any

one now-a-days takes seriously the theory that the passages in the synoptic gospels are an antedating of the later communion rite of the church. Mark gives us, even though it be in an admittedly very concise form, a dependable narrative concerning that which took place on the occasion. There can be no doubt that by his words and action Jesus wanted to safeguard the continued communion between Himself and his disciples after his departure. He bound his presence to the breaking of the bread—"this is my body," that is, this is myself. He explained furthermore that a new covenant would be established through his sacrificial death, and that he who drinks of the cup is received or renewed in this covenant. Such is also the backing of Paul about the sacrament in I Corinthians 11. Between the Messiah and his apostle there is essential agreement. Jesus enjoined that the historical table-fellowship between Himself and his disciples should in the future serve as the form of their ritual fellowship with each other. In the Pauline form of the words of institution Jesus says, "This do in remembrance of Me." The historical and the sacramental become one in the Eucharist. The "remembrance" implies also the sacramental presence. At one with it is the eschatological element. Jesus said, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Paul writes, "As oft as ye eat of this bread and drink of this cup, ye proclaim the death of the Lord, until he cometh."

The Lord and his apostle stand on the same ground. This is apparent also from the fact that the decisive and basic word in Paul is "faith." "From faith to faith." Faith builds on history and comprehends it, but merges it with the present moment and stretches toward the future fulfilment. Faith is faith in the Gospel and its historical facts, but therein a faith in the living and present and coming Lord. That which has happened and that which is, becomes in Paul one eschatological reality. The one cannot exist apart from the other, either in the consciousness of faith or in the sacrament.

It is, however, clear that Paul did not consider it to be his task especially to emphasize this relationship, or to underscore and

elevate the historical basis of faith. For him faith itself meant a relationship to history, and his concern had rather to do with the significance of faith as the foundation of righteousness in the New Covenant. *Righteousness of faith* is Paul's great theme, the underlying theme both of his proclamation and his instruction. Having arrived at this point we are confronted by the second question, namely, as to Paul's place in the history of ideas or rather the history of theology in the early church.

It fell to the lot of Paul to explain to the church the concept of *righteousness* in the New Covenant. For this he possessed particular qualifications. The situation which confronted him at the time he was called to become the "apostle of the Gentiles" in itself made necessary an authoritative interpretation of the reality of Christ from the viewpoint of righteousness. The law and the works of the law were the basis of righteousness in Israel, both in Palestine and in the Hellenic world. What would be the place of the law in the new Israel, in the redeemed and sanctified eschatological people of God?

From the first it is at once a question of *righteousness,* of the revealed will of God, of His favor. Paul had no interest in any other kind of religion than this. This, too, was the question he met everywhere on his missionary journeys, from all the Jews and from many Greeks—how shall I attain to righteousness, reach the goal, fulfil the divine command, stand on the day of judgment? This was for the Jew the traditional statement of the religious problem, the central and only possible question of life and death. But in many cases the Greek, too, was inclined toward the same formulation. In general we overestimate very greatly the element of mystery in the popular religion of the Greeks. Certainly at this time the strongest spiritual force in the Hellenic world was the Stoic school and the influences emanating from it. In its popular, practical form Stoicism contained a strong element of morality. Fundamental in the cultural world was the Hellenic view of life, which in its popular philosophical form stressed a severely ethical principle of recompense—a sort of Greek legalism without written law, yet absolutely binding. Sin, guilt, judgment, punishment, for-

giveness, were concepts as vital and fateful for the Greeks as for the Jews. Past guilt, a future reckoning and recompense were burning, practical issues which occupied the mind and held it with iron grip. Talk of redemption touched the conscience of many a Greek and carried meaning to his consciousness of guilt.

The gospel of Paul was therefore a power unto salvation both to Jew and Greek. This gospel had its center in *making* a man righteous. It is one of Albert Schweitzer's greatest mistakes that he considers the teaching of justification to be a polemical by-product of Pauline thought, a theoretical scaffolding without practical significance. In reality exactly the opposite is true. All real understanding of Paul must proceed from his teaching as to how man becomes righteous through faith in a justifying act of God. Even the formulation is of importance—it is not a question of how man wins God's favor through his own acts, but of how man can be incorporated into the Christ-reality and become the child of God, receiving His righteousness and sharing in His life and nature. This is the message of Paul to Jew and Gentile, and he took great pains to explain its meaning and its consequences, as well as to anchor his teaching in Scripture. He interprets the new situation created by Christ, the nature and demands of the New Covenant.

To what extent did Paul thereby fulfil the intentions of Jesus?

It is obvious that the sharply formulated antithesis between the works of the law and faith in Paul's statement of righteousness is not to be found in the teaching of Jesus. Still we venture to assert that Paul's teaching concerning the justification of man through faith in Christ has its root and presupposition in the teaching of Jesus and in His actual situation, and expresses in principle what Jesus taught and sought. This thesis can be more fully substantiated.

"Repent and believe the Gospel" was the message of Jesus to the people of Israel in the fulness of time. The simple folk, the children, and the poor responded to this message, whereas the truth remained concealed from the wise and the learned. Clearly we are

here in an entirely different spiritual atmosphere than that of Jewish legalism—other norms prevail, and just therefore time has reached its fulfilment. The Messiah and the Kingdom have come, God now acts decisively and conclusively, His invitation is now extended through the Son of Man. Man is called upon to give himself in faith and obedience to that which now takes place and accept the invitation, thus leaving his own way and yielding completely to the divine action, receiving the Kingdom. In principle this is the same eschatological transformation of the Jewish message as Paul had formulated in his doctrine of justification—God creates the possibility of salvation, not by promulgating a series of new commandments and prohibitions which are to be observed, but by establishing the Kingdom (Jesus), a Righteousness (Paul), into which he receives the willing and receptive believer, and so also into his love and kingly mercy. This love and mercy are now the principles of life, the strength and the goal of the righteous man.

The very terminology of Paul gives expression to the radical and revolutionary nature of this view—the sinner is justified without merit, by grace. It sounds paradoxical, it is meant to do so. But if we are to understand Paul aright we must ever keep in mind that the assertion, "God makes the sinner righteous by grace without any merit on his part," is no religious axiom, but an eschatological declaration—it is an interpretation of what happened by the coming of the Messiah. Hitherto it had not been valid, though from the beginning it had been a part of God's thought, purpose and plan. It is *now* that this proclamation holds and in the very proclamation itself the possibility of justification presents itself to those who hear. The Gospel announces what has come to be a reality in the day of fulfilment, when God's dealing with Israel reaches its culmination and completion. The paradox in Paul's formulation consists therefore not in some more deeply reformatory insight which turns prevailing notions upside down, but expresses a change to a new and totally different situation.

This makes it of essential significance for our problem to investigate to what extent the words and deeds of Jesus had this eschatological character. The paradoxical and revolutionary ele-

ments in the teachings and actions of Jesus have of course found expression in much that has been preserved through tradition, for example in the parables of the workers in the vineyard, of the Pharisee and the Publican, of the nature of the Kingdom, as well as in his conversation with publicans and sinners. But when he overturns all accepted Jewish ideas, he does so not as a correction of the Jews, but as a revelation of what now, in the time of the Messiah, has become prevailing law and norm in the relationship of God and His people. The error of the Pharisees and the Scribes is not that their doctrine is false but that they have not believed in him whom the Father has sent. On this central point there is fundamental agreement between Jesus and Paul, however differently they describe it. Both in the Lord and his Apostle that which ultimately matters is faith in and obedience to the eschatological announcement.

"Believe the gospel" is the central and common concern both of Jesus and of Paul. There are those who would discern traces of Pauline influence in the summary of the preaching of Jesus which Mark gives us in the beginning of his gospel. But this summary harmonizes so well with the rest of Jesus' words about the nature of the Kingdom and about receiving his message that we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the theme of the teaching of Jesus as Mark has reported or formulated it. We might in this connection recall especially Jesus' parable of the Sower (Mark 4): here the theme is nothing less than the eschatological proclamation and faith. Only where the seed falls in good earth, where the Word encounters genuine faith, can there be good fruit!

It is not possible to prove that there is a fundamental and essential difference between the gospel of Jesus and of Paul. The difference, which is obvious, is the difference between the situation existing before, and after Easter and Pentecost. The Easter gospel with its religious and ethical consequences is latent in Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God and of Himself as the Son of Man. Such an assertion may seem bold over against the fact that the faith and life of the church after Easter and Pentecost were altogether determined by the Cross and the Resurrection, by baptism

and the Spirit—themes which quite naturally are altogether missing in Jesus' own teaching as this is represented in the synoptic tradition. Does not this then mean that we must maintain the old distinction between the gospel of Jesus and the gospel about Jesus Christ? Can we bridge these differences by any constructions of biblical theology? Are we not finally forced to choose between the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer on one hand and the Pauline (and Johannine) dogma on the other?

Lest we leap to too rapid and sure conclusions in this direction we need to observe another fact, namely that "the second gospel" can be proved to have been immediately derived from the first. This is evidence that the origin of the Easter faith and of the Pentecost experience lay in the person and deeds of Jesus. The Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer are not Jewish documents, nor do they represent a sublimated and deepened Jewish character. They express a religious reality in the day of fulfilment, coming from the Son of Man. Here is present implicitly what later comes to light and occupies the foreground. Easter and Pentecost, thus, do not mean that the Jesus tradition centering in Galilee and Jerusalem have become antiquated and relegated to oblivion. On the contrary, even the first congregation found its inspiration and direction in the story of Jesus. Then as now the Church's treasure of the risen Lord and his Spirit was manifest to the congregation in the gospel lections of the liturgy with their human and historical features of the Saviour. In this picture faith found its foundation. It is absolutely essential for faith to see the Lord in glory and the Christ incarnate as one. The difference between the human figure and the Eastern "dogmas" is then not an obstacle nor a temptation, but something natural, self-evident, even necessary. We are dealing with one and the same person, one and the same event, on different levels, though different levels of one and the same series of historical happenings—God's dealing with Israel and the world through the Son in the last times, in the fullness of time when the eschatological people of God, the people of faith, are formed around the Son of Man and created to become His body in the world.

The problem of "Jesus and Paul" can be solved in this direction and from this point of view. Paul interprets the meaning of the eschatological situation after the resurrection from the standpoint of righteousness. In this he follows a fundamental aim of the teaching of Jesus regarding the kingdom of God and gives radical and essential expression to what already lay in the message of Jesus, "Repent and believe the Gospel."

(Continued in November Issue)

Luther's Musical Achievement

Robert Stevenson

LUTHER proclaimed as did no other religious leader of his century the supreme value of music in church life. Music in his scale of values ranked second only to theology itself. Something of a performer and a composer himself, he tirelessly strove for superior quality in evangelical music.

During his later career he became ever more bitter in attacking Roman usages which seemed to him impurities; but however vehement he became in denouncing these impurities, he never for a moment classified the music of the Roman Church in the list of offending practices. Other reformers violently protested against the patterns of musical life which were current in the sixteenth century Catholic Church, and occasionally (as with Zwingli) sought to banish all concerted music from the reformed church because of its corrupt Roman associations.

At Zürich under Zwingli's influence the magistrates in 1524 decreed there should be "no more playing on organs in the city and in the churches,"[1] and therefore soon afterwards the organ of the Great Minster was broken to pieces. In 1525 all choral singing was discontinued at Zürich in order to allow more time for "prophesyings."[2] In greater or lesser degree than Zwingli other leaders such as Carlstadt, Farel, Bucer, and Bullinger, not to mention Calvin (whose philosophy of church music we shall later treat separately), opposed organ playing and choral singing.

Luther, on the other hand, since he consistently championed not only congregational singing but also the kind of elaborate polyphonic music that only trained choirs can perform, ran counter to the prevailing tendency among reformers. Because he so strenu-

1 B. J. Kidd (editor), *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (Oxford, 1911), p. 443.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 448-449.

ously exerted himself in behalf of music his philosophy of church music seems today considerably more attractive to most musicians than does that of any other sixteenth century Protestant leader.

The specific reasons his principles of church music seem attractive today may be listed, and then examined and documented. 1) He showed admirable discrimination in his own evaluation of contemporary composers, thus setting a standard of correct musical judgment. 2) He defined music as an art which to be properly appreciated must be studied rather than merely listened to. 3) He made music study a mandatory part of the curriculum in all schools organized under his auspices. 4) He required the ministers who followed his lead to study singing, and made an understanding of music a prerequisite to ordination. 5) He overrode the scruples of those who, following St. Augustine's example, feared elaborate church music on moral grounds. 6) He spoke often and ardently in behalf of *excellence* in church music. 7) While exalting the rôle of the congregation he never minimized the rôle of the organist nor of the choir in church music. 8) He upheld the right of musicians to an adequate and assured income from church sources.

Documentation for these aspects of his philosophy is easy to assemble, not only because he wrote so specifically in praise of music, but also because the very obviousness of his interest in church music has attracted the attention of all Luther scholars. In 1946, on the four hundredth anniversary of his death, an important article appeared in which more than twenty extensive quotations from Luther on the subject of music were gathered.[3] And two years later an entire book appeared, entitled *Luther and Music.*[4] A book entitled *Calvin and Music,* or *Cranmer and Music,* or *Knox and Music,* would be inconceivable simply because in the scheme of values prescribed by these other founding fathers of the century, church music occupied a subsidiary rather than an exalted position. It is worthy of note that even the Tridentine fathers were far from being as cordial in their acceptance of polyphonic music as was Luther. At the twenty-second session of the Council of

3 Walter E. Buszin, "Luther on Music," *Musical Quarterly,* January, 1946, p. 80 ff.
4 Paul Nettl, *Luther and Music* (Philadelphia, 1948).

Trent in 1562 occurred the famous instance when polyphonic music was almost banished from the Catholic Church.[5]

Because Luther's own knowledge of the craft and technique of music composition exceeded that of a mere dilettante he was able to make his own musical judgments in a remarkably prescient manner. He, for instance, was an ardent advocate of the music of Joaquin des Près, whom he correctly evalued as the greatest composer of the epoch. He also commended Pierre de la Rue in warm terms;[6] Ludwig Senfl was another of his favorite composers. The fact that in 1530 when Luther wrote his famous letter of praise to Senfl, the composer was a Catholic rather than a Lutheran did not affect Luther's liking for his music.[7] Particularly admirable do we find Luther's attitude today, not only because his own musical judgments have stood the rigorous tests of time, but also because he never allowed religious associations to dampen his enthusiasm for excellence in music wherever he found it.

Luther continued to love the music of "the hymns of the papacy," and as late as 1542 sponsored publication of a collection of *Christliche Geseng Lateinisch und Deutsch, zum Begrebnis,* in the preface of which he wrote

> We have chosen songs which are used in the papacy at vigils, masses for the dead, and funerals. Some of these we have printed in this little book and purpose in the future to choose more of them. . . . The songs and notes are precious; it would be a shame and loss were they to disappear; but the texts or words are unchristian.[8]

As far as music was concerned, Luther showed continuous readiness to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.

In his preface to the first hymn booklet issued at Wittenberg in 1524, he announced as a reason for using four parts his desire

5 H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (London, 1941), p. 424. J. van Kerle at the behest of the Cardinal-Archbishop of Augsburg composed a set of *Preces speciales pro salubri generalis concilii successu et conclusione,* Venice, 1562, the performance of which at the Council helped to turn the tide in favor of polyphony.

6 Buszin, "Luther on Music," p. 91.

7 His high regard for Senfl did not diminish during his later years. See the *Werke* (Erlangen edition), Vol. LXII, p. 309.

8 *Werke* (Erlangen ed.), LVI, 301.

that the young people be *trained* in music. "Music," he said on another occasion, "is a semi-discipline and task-mistress."[9] Music as Luther viewed the art must be studied rather than merely "enjoyed." Music study, furthermore, must start early, and must form a mandatory part of the school curriculum.

> I have always loved music. Those who have mastered this art are made of good stuff, and are fit for any task. It is necessary indeed that music be taught in the schools. A teacher must be able to sing; otherwise I will not so much as look at him.[10]

From the standpoint of the church musician, Luther's insistence upon music study as a necessary prerequisite to ordination seems especially interesting. "Also, we should not ordain young men into the ministry unless they have become well acquainted with music in the schools."[11] The level of musical competence which Luther's vernacular liturgy, *Deudsche Messe und Ordnung Gottesdiensts,* presupposes in the officiating minister is high. If Luther had intended the *Deudsche Messe* for restricted usage among educated congregations, his musical demands on the officiant might not seem strange, but as he explicitly stated in the preface to his German liturgy, he introduced the vernacular "for the sake of the simple layman."

The officiating minister was required in the *Deudsche Messe* to sing the Epistle in the eighth tone, that is to say in the Hypomixolydian mode; the Gospel he was required to sing in the fifth tone, that is to say the Lydian mode. Luther himself provided exemplary melodies for both Epistles and Gospels, showing what melodic inflections must be used at first commas, second commas, colons, periods, question marks, and endings of lessons. The melodic formulas for narrative portions of the Gospels differ in Luther's settings from the melodic formulas prescribed for the words of Christ. Christ's words are always to be sung in the lower register of the voice. Not only the melodic inflections but also the flow of

9 *Ibid.,* LXII, 308.
10 *Ibid.,* LXII, 309.
11 *Ibid.,* LXII, 309.

the rhythm is prescribed in *Deudsche Messe.* Unlike Gregorian chant, Luther's monody uses notes of varying lengths in order to secure expressivity. In the German Sanctus as Luther wrote it, for instance, each *Heilig* begins with a note for the first syllable, "hei-," which is twice the length of the other notes in the same phrase. Without here attempting to offer a minute analysis of the music which he wrote for *Deudsche Messe,* we may simply summarize by saying that a minister using it would certainly need to be a vocalist with a considerable range and a well-developed ability to sight-sing.

Luther himself had a good voice, according to contemporary testimony, and was also a competent lute player. He dabbled in polyphonic composition, and if not an adept, at least knew how to write in parts. His settings for *Deudsche Messe* were assuredly his own creation. In a famous passage from *Syntagma Musicum* old Johann Walther, Luther's musical assistant who helped prepare the 1524 *Geystliche Gesangk Buchleyn,* tells how in 1526 Luther with his aid and that of Konrad Rupsch, Capellmeister of Torgau, set about preparing the music for the *Deudsche Messe.* "Luther himself wrote the music for the lessons and the words of institution. . . . He kept me for three weeks to note down properly the chants of the Gospels and the Epistles, until the first mass was sung in Wittenberg."[12]

We should therefore note that Luther himself demanded musical intelligence and a trained voice, both by precept and example. The music was of such importance in his estimation that he could take time to attend to the writing of suitable melodies for the liturgy himself; whatever other matters might be allowed to fall into the discard basket as adiaphora, music was not to be amongst them.

Some conscientious souls eschewed elaborate music in Luther's day on the same grounds that St. Augustine had frowned upon it—because it gave too much sensuous enjoyment. Augustine's attitude had been shared by a number of prominent religious leaders during the Middle Ages. Wyclif, Luther's precursor in whit-

12 Michael Praetorius, *Syntagma Musicum* (Wittenberg, 1615), Vol. I, pp. 451-452.

tling down the claims of the papacy, violently inveighed in his *Sermon on the Contemplative Life* against elaborate music. Luther, however, opposed Augustine's authority with his own in musical matters. "St. Augustine was afflicted with scruples of conscience," Luther said, "but if he were living today, he would hold with us."[13] At another time Luther added

> Next to the word of God, only music deserves being extolled as the mistress and governess of human feelings. . . . Through the medium of music the Holy Spirit placed His gifts in the hands of the Prophets; again through music the devil was driven away, as was the case with Saul, king of Israel. . . . The Fathers and Prophets desired . . . that nothing be more intimately linked up with the Word of God than music.[14]

Consistently, moreover, Luther strove for excellence in evangelical music. Small details such as smudged or incorrectly printed notes in evangelical hymn booklets disturbed him, and he required fresh editions when errors were found in the music. "Luther was always ready to detect misprints and errors in the music. When he did so, at once he took it away, and saw to it that the piece was properly set and rectified."[15]

He was able to understand the peculiar excellencies of the Netherlandish contrapuntalists, and desired similar standards of artifice in evangelical composition. His description of the beauties of polyphony indicates how sensitive he was to the elaborations of counterpoint.

> When natural music is sharpened and polished by art, then one begins to see with amazement the great and perfect wisdom of God in his wonderful work of music, where one voice takes a simple part and around it sing three, four, or five other voices, leaping and springing round about, marvellously gracing the simple part, like a square dance in heaven, with friendly bows, embracings, and hearty swinging of partners.[16]

13 *Werke,* LXII, 111.

14 *Opera Latina* (Frankfurt, 1873), Vol. VII, pp. 552-553.

15 Nettl, *Luther and Music,* p. 61 (quoting Ratzberger).

16 R. H. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York, 1950), p. 343. Quotation from Luther's foreword to Georg Rhau, *Symphoniae incundae atque adeo breves quattuor vocum ab optimis pluribusque musicis compositae* (1538).

Because he understood the mission of counterpoint as did no other religious leader of his time, he never felt inclined to dispense with trained choirs, without which contrapuntal singing is impossible. His pioneering in hymnody has sometimes been interpreted as a slap at choirs and a friendly pat on congregations. While it is true he contributed tremendously to the advance of congregational singing, it is not true that he minimized choirs. For him it was not an *either-or* decision as far as choral singing versus congregational singing was concerned, but rather a *both-and* proposition. As for organ playing: while some scholars such as Schweitzer have thought him not over-friendly to organs, he certainly never showed any animosities. In his exegesis of Psalm 150 he spoke in behalf of organs, and elsewhere he mentioned certain contemporary organists with warm approval.[17] No organs were pulled down in Lutheran areas, as they often were in Zwinglian and Calvinistic areas.

In a purely practical sense, Luther's befriending of church music took the ever-welcome form of financial patronage. Words in themselves would have meant little without the tangible encouragement of money for church music. "The art of music is worthy of being supported and maintained by princes and lords. . . . The goods and possessions belonging to monasteries could well be used to take care of these people [the Kantorei]," wrote Luther to John the Steadfast. At a later date he said, "Kings, princes, and lords must support music. . . . One reads in the Bible that pious kings supported, maintained, and gave salaries to singers."[18] In his letter to Senfl, written October 4, 1530, he said, "I love your Bavarian dukes, even though they certainly dislike me. I honor them above all others because they cultivate and honor music."

Luther extolled the Catholic Bavarian house simply because the reigning dukes gave liberally in support of a musical establish-

17 Karl Anton, *Luther und die Musik* (Zwickau, 1928), contains a useful digest of passages pertaining to instrumental music.

18 *Werke,* LIII, 375.

19 *Werke,* LXII, 308.

20 See Emil Naumann, *History of Music,* London, I, 488, for a fuller discussion of the Bavarian dukes as patrons of music.

ment. Not by chance was Orlandus Lassus later able to find his most fertile area of enterprise in Munich. The reigning house had already set the pattern of liberal patronage during Luther's lifetime. When during a tour of inspection Luther found music liberally patronized in evangelical Torgau, he praised the town simply because music was there richly supported: "God Almighty has graciously blessed this city of Torgau," he said after examining its musical establishment. Not by chance was Torgau the place where in 1627, a century after Luther's inspection tour, the first German opera, Schütz's *Daphne*, was presented; a strong musical tradition spanning more than a century had prepared Torgau for this significant milestone of musical progress. Indeed the preeminence of German music during the last four centuries can in no small measure be traced to the numberless little Torgau's where Luther's precepts on music have been taken seriously, for out of the Eisenachs and Halles have come the Bachs and Handels.

In summary, we may say of Luther's musical achievement that he lifted the art to the loftiest level it has ever attained in evangelical thinking. Both theoretically and practically he placed it on a pedestal. No advance we may make in church music will exceed his ideal of what it should be. A practical implementation of his ideals would today be "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

Psychology and Religion. A Study of Recent Trends

Carl J. Schindler

MANKIND had practiced religion a long time before the Greeks first raised the question: What is this powerful psychic phenomenon that reaches deeply into the very structure of the personality and evokes feelings of awe, of veneration and fear of the gods? The sophists explained it as a product of man's imagination, of deities created in the image of man. Socrates saw in it a divine spark, a revelation of the deity in the *daimonion* of the individual. The centuries have added little to these two basic positions. The question still remains: Does the believer touch a reality outside of himself or does he merely listen to the echo of his own subconscious?

Toward the end of the last century when psychology became a science in its own right, psychologists soon turned to an investigation of religious phenomena. The rich emotional content of the religious life, its ritual and symbolism, the intensity of the religious experience and the abundance of material made this subject attractive to the psychologist. The early investigators studied such spectacular manifestations of the religious life as mysticism, conversions, revivals and especially the psychosomatic episodes of visions, trance-states, and glossolalia.

Men like J. H. Leuba, E. D. Starbuck, J. Stanley Hall and particularly William James were interested in the abnormal, in the hope that it might shed some light on the normal function of the religious life. It was the same kind of reasoning that led anthropologists into the jungles, because it was felt that a study of primitive societies would go far in explaining the nature of more complex social structures. Much material was gathered but the results were largely disappointing. The abnormal and the primitive

failed to explain the psychic and social organization of modern man.

A notable change has occurred within the last few decades. Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) took as his starting point the individual in his contemporary culture and raised the problem which has since become dominant in the psychological study of religion: What does religion contribute towards the formation of character? Freud's own answer was negative. Religion is a form of mass neurosis into which man directs very powerful drives of love and hatred, wishes for life and death. For himself Freud disclaimed any need for religion but he retained a life-long strong interest in the religious experiences of others. It made little difference to him whether this individual was Michelangelo or a demented German government official of his own day (*Die Memoiren des Geheimrat Schreber*) or a religious genius like Moses, who became the subject of his last book.

In the technological era after World War I the interest in psychology of religion declined but of late several important studies in this field have again been published.

Among the outstanding contemporary psychologists who have concerned themselves with the religious quest is Carl G. Jung (1875-) the son of a Swiss Reformed pastor. Jung began his career as a pupil of Freud but broke with the master over the interpretation of the role of sex in the formation of neuroses. Not the libido but the failure to find meaning in life is the core of neurotic illness. A Swiss theologian, Dr. Hans Schaer, has offered an excellent presentation of Jung's system in *Religion and the Cure of Souls* (New York: Pantheon Book Co., 1950). Religious experience for Jung is psychic reality. The psychologist must admit that the experience is real, though it does not tell us anything about the factual existence of its object. The psychologist can therefore use the terms "God" and "God-image" almost interchangeably. Religion, on the other hand, is not invalidated by the fact that some people never experience it. Such a person can only say: For myself, I am incapable of feeling anything, as others may be incapable of an aesthetic experience. For Jung not only is a religious experi-

ence sound, but no one can achieve wholeness without it. That is the meaning of his often quoted statement: "Among all my patients in the second half of life—that is, after thirty-five—there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life. It is safe to say that every one fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has really been healed, who did not regain his religious outlook" (*Modern Man in Search of a Soul*).

This healing process occurs in our society as a Catholic or Protestant experience. Jung who became known for his description of "types of personality" also distinguishes between "born Catholics" and "born Protestants." These terms do not necessarily indicate a person's actual church affiliation. The born Catholic is a person in whom "Christian symbolism" is still operative. The outward signs of the religious life are meaningful to him. The hierarchy, the sacraments, the ritual, the visible church are healing forces, but they prevent him from ever having the Protestant experience where man stands alone and everything is taken back into the psyche. The Protestant experience is therefore deeper, more disturbing or in Jung's own language, "dangerous." Jung quotes Hebrews 10:31: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Protestantism thus gives rise to theologies of dread or crisis. By freeing man, however, from the control of symbols an unbiased view of the psyche and the rise of modern science become possible. Jung, the ultra-liberal Protestant, is thus forced into the paradoxical position in which he extols the depth of the Protestant experience but seeks protection against its soul-shattering effects in the Catholic dogma.

The Catholic approach itself is well presented by Fulton J. Sheen, *Peace of Soul* (New York: Whittlesley House, 1949), and Alan Keenan, O.F.M., *Neuroses and the Sacraments* (Sheed and Ward, 1950).

Until recently the Catholic Church had shown little interest in a religious ministry to the mentally ill or a psychology that went beyond the traditional concepts of St. Thomas Aquinas. The books

by Sheen and Keenan are intended to defend the Catholic position against what is often referred to as "pagan or materialistic psychiatry." Both writers are keenly alive to the threat that Freudianism offers to any Christian interpretation of the personality. Sheen particularly wants to make it clear that he has no quarrel with psychiatry or psychoanalysis but with "that single psychoanalytic group who assert these things: Man is an animal; there is no personal responsibility and therefore no guilt; the psychoanalytic method is a substitute for confession." Protestants will readily agree with Monsignor Sheen that a materialistic interpretation of the psyche leaves no room for Christian faith or ethics, but they will deny that the only alternative is an acceptance of Catholicism in toto. Sheen and Keenan show, by the way, that Jung was right when he stated that the religious experience in the Catholic Church has become wholly objectified and institutionalized. The two Catholic theologians stress the helplessness of the Protestant because he lacks the guidance of an infallible church and the integration into the mystic Body of Christ which can only be achieved by the use of the sacraments. Keenan's whole theory is based on the sacraments. He seems to be unaware that one cannot cure neurotic dependence upon others by creating an even stronger dependence upon sacerdotal ministrations. That kind of churchmanship may give temporary relief from anxiety but will never overcome it. The well known Catholic affliction, scrupulosity, in which a penitent feels guilt and the need of confession a few minutes after he has received absolution, shows how unrealistic this therapy actually is. Even Monsignor Sheen, who understands the torn soul of modern man much better than Keenan, has no other solution but a return to Thomism. As a philosopher he has a perfect right to prefer the metaphysics of Thomas to any other, but as a psychologist he simply misrepresents the facts when he asserts "that regular confession prevents our sins, our fears, our anxieties from seeping into the unconscious and degenerating into melancholy, psychoses and neuroses" (p. 146). Equally dubious is his claim that "meditation upon death is similar to the electric shock by which the mind in order to escape what seems like dissolution,

puts off his fantasy and the patient is put back into the real world" (p. 226).

The tendency to isolate Catholic thought from any real contact with secular science and construct a closed philosophy of life becomes very evident in these adventures into the field of psychology.

That psychoanalysis and religion are "neither irreconcilable nor identical" is the claim of Erich Fromm, a practicing analyst in *Psychoanalysis and Religion* (Yale University Press, 1950). The psychologist finds in all religions a recurring pattern. A religion is either authoritarian or humanistic. An authoritarian religion sets up a transcendental God who incorporates within himself love, wisdom, and ethical perfection. As the deity is elevated, the believer becomes impoverished and degraded. After he has given to God all he has, i.e., his human love, reason, aspirations, he must ask God to restore to him a portion of what he himself originally had given to God. He feels sinful because he has deprived himself of everything that was once good in him. In worship he tries to get in touch with that part of himself that he has lost through projection. He is filled with hate and disgust for himself and depends upon a priest to absolve him from his guilt. He develops hate and intolerance as a reaction against his own submission. He needs help in a world close to madness and finds it in the psychoanalyst who is "a physician of the soul." The analyst leads him into a religion of humanism where love of truth and love of man prevail. The individual no longer feels guilt for he is now striving for improvement rather than a static unattainable goal of ethical perfection. Because he no longer reaches for the impossible, he no longer feels frustration and futility.

Fromm makes many thoughtful statements about the devaluation of modern man who is lost in a crowd and has only "an exchange or market value." The fact that a humanistic religion has lost all genuinely religious characteristics does not disturb Fromm. The distinction between religion and morality has no practical value and belongs to the field of semantics. What Fromm has done to the concept of God, Otto Rank, who died in 1939 in this coun-

try after having been Secretary of the Psychoanalytic Institute in Vienna, did to the concept of soul and immortality. In *Psychology and the Soul* (translated from the German by Wm. Turner and published by the University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1950) we are told that the belief in the soul arose from the belief in a "Double" whom primitive man saw in his dreams. Since the dead, particularly those who die of violence frequently appear in dreams, it was assumed that they continue their existence in a spirit world. Soul and immortality are nothing but products of the psyche, but as such they are entitled to the interest of the psychologist who studies the fantasy life of man. Under this treatment Christian beliefs evaporate into universal myths. "Christ personified the immortal soul which accounts for his thoroughly non-human traits. His death and resurrection are the essential features of the soul, just as the immortal Double the mortal bodily self" (p. 28). Primitive man believed that he sacrificed his own immortality in begetting a child who in turn became the owner of the father's soul. The "Son" in Christian theology becomes a collective term for immortality, for in the Christian era a man no longer forfeits his chance for survival by becoming the father of a child. "Christianity tried to unite individual immortality and sexuality as the means thereto, into the characteristic glorification of the child or son."

The tendency to disregard the obvious meaning of words, to distort historical data, to find hidden, sexual meanings in all forms of religious behavior turns this investigation into an absurdity. It tells us nothing about the soul but much about the aims and methods of some analysts, who like the scribes of old compass sea and land, yet never find anything but their own tightly knit little system.

That psychology can help us to understand, rather than misrepresent Christianity, becomes evident in two other recent publications. *Psychotherapy and Religion* by Professor David C. Roberts of Union Theological Seminary (New York: Scribner's, 1950) takes the position that psychology and religion can cooperate and neither needs to surrender its basic tenets to make such

cooperation possible. Man is threatened, but the threats arise not from the external forces of nature, but from his "untamed irrational drives, his cruelty, his capacity for collective self-deception and mistrust." A theology which offers ethical precepts without taking man's basic nature into consideration is ineffectual. Actually Christianity has influenced the course of events only in a limited degree, because it has addressed itself to man's reasonableness, his intellectual grasp of the Christian way of life, without relating it to his emotional reactions. For that reason our theoretical views on such issues as race relations, social justice, world affairs are often contradicted by our conduct in actual situations. Psychology cannot solve the dilemma, either. While it furnishes us with an understanding of man's emotional life, it cannot by itself evolve moral ideals. Only the biblical concept of man as the image of God can show us the direction in which we must proceed. Our intelligence and freedom which distinguish us from the animals are at the same time the marks of our grandeur and misery. In the process of salvation man is not merely an unwilling object (God is the potter, man is the clay) but an active participant. Salvation is not a dramatic episode but a continuous re-affirmation of those values which found their supreme disclosure in Christ.

The structure of the religious experience is analyzed by Gordon W. Allport, Professor of Psychology at Harvard University. In *The Individual and His Religion* (New York: MacMillan, 1950) Professor Allport states that every attempt to explain religion as a by-product of psychic or social processes must fail, because it misunderstands the nature of the religious quest. Religion is not "wishful thinking for supernatural help," because all great religions call their followers to lives of surrender and self-denial. It is not a means of social control, for the great founders of religion were singularly indifferent towards the social order in which they lived. Religion is an experience sui generis as truly as the experience of beauty and rational thought. The religious development of the individual bears traces of his temperament and environment but grows beyond it into a religion of maturity. The distinguishing mark of a mature person is described as a differ-

entiated sentiment. Such an individual examines all the elements of experience and selects the ones he can form into a total integrated philosophy of life. For that reason no two people ever hold exactly identical religious views. An undifferentiated sentiment assimilates fragments of unrelated experiences, usually upon the basis of authority, but lacks the critical ability to exclude incongruous elements. Dr. Allport reminds us that differentiation implies not only the capacity for constructive criticism but the more essential ability to arrange the chosen parts into a meaningful order. The essence of a differentiated sentiment is the strength to "prove all things and to hold on to that which is good."

It appears to this reviewer that little can be expected from additional systematic studies in the field of psychology of religion until we know more about the body-mind relationship, the real nature of mental illness, and the effects of great social upheavals upon men's minds. The next challenging subject for the psychologist of religion should be the history of the Christian Church. What are the psychic drives that motivate great representatives of the religious life, like St. Paul, St. Augustine, Luther? How are we to understand such movements as Montanism, Anabaptism, Pietism? What constitutes the psychological genius of Lutheranism? A few beginnings in that direction have been made in the past. As early as 1905 Frederick M. Davenport described the *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals.* Oscar Pfister published a psychoanalytic study of *The Piety of Count Zinzendorf* in 1910. Of more recent date is the brilliant investigation of Frederick Heiler, *Der Katholizismus, seine Idee und seine Erscheinung* (1923), and Percy G. Hopwood's *The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church* (1937).

Much more can and should be done to interpret the history of Christianity not only as succession of theologies but as the struggle of the human heart for a deeper understanding and a more abiding communion with God.

The Scriptural and Theological Basis of Evangelism and Stewardship

T. A. Kantonen

VALID faith in Jesus Christ, according to the Apostle Paul, is "faith which worketh by love" (Galatians 5:6). In the same spirit Luther describes faith as a "restless thing" which cannot but engage in works of love and obedience to God. Evangelism and stewardship derive their importance from being primary manifestations of this activity of faith. Evangelism means to reach those outside the church with the word of the Gospel in order that they may be led to Christ and the fellowship of his church. Stewardship is the believer's whole life as motivated by responding love and gratitude for what he has received from God. Representing faith itself in its dynamic and practical aspect, neither evangelism nor stewardship is founded upon any isolated proof-texts or theological concepts but upon the total meaning of the Christian faith. The basis for these activities may therefore be appropriately stated in terms of the three articles of the Creed.

I. FAITH IN GOD THE CREATOR

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth

God Himself is the true starting-point of all Christian thought and activity. "In the beginning God . . ." (Genesis 1:1). He is the primary reality from which everything else, even our thinking about Him, is derived. Faith, the response to God's revelation of Himself, acknowledges first of all that God is God, the maker and owner of all that exists. "Behold the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God, the earth also, with all that therein is" (Deuteronomy 10:14). Everything belongs to Him on the basis of creation. "The sea is his and he made it, and his hands formed

the dry land" (Psalm 95:5). "For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things" (Romans 11:36).

The Creator's right of ownership extends also to humanity. "It is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves, we are his people" (Psalm 100:3). All nations are His property, but the people to whom He has revealed His truth has learned to appreciate the blessing contained in belonging to Him and to acknowledge gratefully: "We are the sheep of his pasture" (Psalm 100:3). Absolute sovereignty over all that we have and are belongs to the very essence of God, and the denial of that sovereignty is the essence of sin. A sinner, as Luther expresses it, is *"incurvatus in se,"* bent upon himself, seeking only his own and loving himself above all, and therefore not allowing God to be God.

The doctrine of creation not only establishes God's absolute sovereignty but it also furnishes two concepts basic to evangelism and stewardship, namely, trusteeship and responsibility. God, the creator and owner of all things, has entrusted to us His property and the realization of His purpose with regard to it. He commits to us the whole world of nature saying: "Replenish the earth and subdue it and have dominion . . . over every living thing that moveth upon the earth" (Genesis 1:28). He also gives to us the commission by which His ultimate purpose of creation is to be fulfilled: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). But one to whom has been entrusted that which belongs to another is accountable to the owner. Human existence is thus responsible existence. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required" (Luke 12:48). Responsibility is an essential feature of the image of God in man. It is because he is personally accountable to his Creator that man has an existence above the animal level. That a correct understanding of the doctrine of creation culminates in a heightened sense of individual responsibility is well portrayed by Luther: "For all of which I am in duty bound to thank, praise, serve and obey him."

The bearing of the concepts of God's sovereignty and man's trusteeship and responsibility upon stewardship is obvious. They make stewardship a philosophy of life which determines not only

religious activity in the narrow sense but also all of life's orders: home, citizenship, business and industry, science, art, and education. Physical health, mental capacities, time, opportunity, material possessions—all these must be viewed as talents which God has entrusted to us to use according to His purpose. In this light our every-day work becomes a sacred vocation in which to serve God.

But the first article of the Creed also has specific implications for evangelism. It provides a cosmic setting for the work of Christ and his church and grounds evangelism in the eternal purpose of the Creator. It is of Christ that the Apostle writes: "All things were created by him and for him" (Colossians 1:16). And God "hath put all things under his feet and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all" (Ephesians 1:22-23). In the work of evangelism we are therefore engaged in nothing less than carrying out the cosmic purpose of Him who "so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son" in order to recover His creation for Himself.

II. FAITH IN GOD THE REDEEMER

I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord

This central article of the Creed contains the heart of the Christian faith and the motivation of all Christian action. Its dynamic meaning cannot be expressed better than in Luther's words:

> I believe that Jesus Christ is my Lord who redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature . . . in order that I might be his own, live under him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness.

The doctrine of redemption presupposes that man is a sinner and as such he is cut off from God. Through sin we have lost the right to divine sonship and the power to carry out the tasks growing out of that sonship. The Gospel is the good news that God Himself has engaged in a triumphant redeeming action to overcome man's sin and in His sovereign grace establishes fellowship with man on the basis of forgiveness. Those who accept the Gospel

of forgiveness in faith receive the power to become not only God's trustees and co-workers but also His children. The motivation for their action is grateful love. "We love him, because he first loved us" (I John 4:19). We give ourselves "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God" (Romans 12:1) to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. The more livingly we know that love the more completely we give ourselves to Him. Thus "having received mercy we faint not" in the work of evangelism which carries the reconciling strategy of the Cross into the lives of others. And inasmuch as we love "not in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth" (I John 3:18), we shoulder the responsibilities of Christian stewardship.

The Gospel of redemption is summarized in the basic concept of Reformation theology, justification by grace, *propter Christum per fidem.* To express redemption in this forensic form, as something that takes place in the courtroom of heaven rather than in the heart of man, is to guard against moralistic and subjectivistic perversion. When deliverance from sin is stated in terms of *sola gratia,* it is shown to be God's own sovereign act which neither needs nor permits human cooperation. Justification is not what God does *with* sinners but what He does *for* sinners. It is the utterly unique, sovereign and paradoxical act of God, who triumphs over sin by giving Himself as sacrifice, who sets us free from sin by making His Son to be sin. Such activities as evangelism and stewardship cannot therefore be deduced directly from justification itself. But faith, man's response to justifying grace, means new life in Christ. Hence the end result of justification cannot be stated in forensic terms alone. The faith-awakening Gospel of redemption is no mere judicial pronouncement but the life-changing "power of God." To be justified is to be taken into a personal fellowship with God which is the source of regenerative power affecting man's whole personality. Luther states it simply but profoundly: "Where there is forgiveness of sins, there is life." Christ redeems us not only from guilt but also from the power of the Devil in order that we may serve our Redeemer with joy and gratitude.

Justification does not mean that we are completely delivered from our sinfulness and made perfectly good. Luther's description of the believer as *simul iustus et peccator* contains a sobering truth which keeps us constantly dependent on the grace of forgiveness. But although we are sinners, "in Christ" God judges us to be worthy to have fellowship with Him and to share in the work of His Kingdom. Particularly significant are the words with which Luther concludes his explanation of the meaning of redemption: "even as he is risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity." Christ's work did not end on the Cross. Through his resurrection he brought into the present world the life of the world to come, and by faith the believer has access into that life. As we come to "know the power of his resurrection" and "rise with Christ into a newness of life," we become the channels through which God releases this power into the present age. Here lies the deepest motivation for evangelism and stewardship.

III. FAITH IN GOD THE SANCTIFIER

I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints

The connection between justification and sanctification has already been anticipated. The redemptive work of Christ remains meaningless until it is apprehended by living faith. But when we ask how such faith is born we are led to the third article of the Creed, the work of the Holy Spirit. For, as Luther explains, "I cannot of my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to him, but the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel." Faith, in the Christian sense, differs from all other forms of belief. It is generated by God Himself, not our reason or will. It is a duplication in individual experience of the miracle of the incarnation: eternity enters time, God's life enters ours. The Christ who died for us becomes the Christ who lives in us. God confronts us with His unfathomable love and we respond with our lives. If with Luther we call this work of the Holy Spirit in giving us faith and keeping us in it "sanctification," it is clear that only

in sanctification do the realities of creation, God's sovereignty, and our responsibility, and the realities of redemption, the forgiveness of sins, and new life in Christ, become vital personal realities. It is therefore in the perspective of sanctification that the works of living faith, evangelism and stewardship, obtain their final and full meaning. But in this perspective it also becomes clear that faith which does not result in these activities is not sound faith.

The doctrine of sanctification has certain specific implications for the work of evangelism and stewardship. First is the idea of *fruitage*. Both our Lord himself and the Apostles have much to say about the "fruits" of true spiritual life. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. . . . Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them" (Matthew 7:18-20). "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matthew 21:43). "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh it away, and every branch that beareth fruit, he cleanseth it that it may bear more fruit" (John 15:2). "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; and so shall ye be my disciples" (John 15:8). "Who was raised from the dead that we might bring forth fruit unto God" (Romans 7:4). The Gospel inverts the maxim of natural religiosity "Good works are necessary for salvation" into "Salvation is necessary for good works." Christian activities are not human achievements but "fruits of the Spirit." But the absence of these fruits indicates dead faith. For faith is not judged by what it says but by what it does. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6:46).

A second implication of sanctification is *obedience*. This is the characteristic manifestation of life in the Spirit. The motif of our Lord's own life on earth was "Thy will be done." But He did not set up two standards, one for himself, another for his people. He expects of those who are his own the same life-investment of obedience to God's will. Quite simply he says "Follow me." Stewardship is nothing but a wholehearted response to this word. And evangelism is loyal obedience to his command "Go and make disciples of all nations" (Matthew 28:19). It is inadequate to define a Chris-

tian as one who believes what Christ taught, or even as one who believes in Christ. We must say: "A Christian is one who follows Christ in the obedience of faith."

One other emphasis growing out of sanctification needs to be singled out, namely, that the fruit-bearing and the life of obedience are not the activities of isolated individuals but always imply the Christian *fellowship*. The Holy Spirit and the holy Christian Church belong inseparably together. As Luther explains, not only has the Holy Spirit "called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith," but He also "calls, gathers, enlightens and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ in the one true faith." It is in this Christian Church that "he daily and richly forgives me and all believers" and He will "grant me and all believers in Christ everlasting life." Christian discipleship is membership in a divinely ordained community, every member of which is consecrated to a kingly and priestly mission. The priesthood of all believers not only expresses the essence of the church and life within it, but it also makes every Christian a witness for Christ and an instrument by which His power becomes a sanctifying influence in the common life of humanity. In doing the work of evangelism and stewardship Christians are thus acting as Christians, exercising the unique privileges and responsibilities of the Christian fellowship.

To summarize, from the doctrine of creation we derive the concepts of God's sovereignty and our trusteeship and responsibility. From the doctrine of redemption we derive our insight into the grace which restores sinners into fellowship with God and awakens the gratitude, joy, and love which motivate us to give our lives to our Redeemer. From the doctrine of sanctification we derive our understanding of the living faith which, drawing upon God's resources, bears fruit in obedience and dedicated service. Faith in God the creator establishes evangelism and stewardship as God's work. Faith in God the Redeemer establishes the basis on which sinful men can do God's work. Faith in God the Sanctifier consecrates us to the doing of this work.

Episcopacy and the Lutheran Church

Edgar S. Brown, Jr.

AT THE sixteenth biennial convention of the United Lutheran Church in America (Philadelphia, October 6-14, 1948), the following resolution was recommended and adopted:

> We recommend that a special commission be appointed by the president to study the possibility of revising the titles of the officers of the ULCA, to make them conform more nearly to the churchly and historical usage, and to present its recommendation to the next convention of the ULCA.[1]

Two years later, at the seventeenth biennial convention (Des Moines, October 4-12, 1950), the report called for in the above resolution was presented by the committee. It appears from this report[2] that the members of the committee took their assigned task not too seriously. The report is an elementary statement containing seven considerations for the use of the historic titles, and nine against. Apparently, the members of the committee were so sure that the matter would be dropped that they failed in their considerations to investigate thoroughly the questions concerning doctrine and polity implicit in the approval, by the Church, of such a recommendation. In fact, so far as I have been able to determine, it was only through the efforts of an interested lay delegate, who presented what must have been a carefully studied paper, that the report was sent back to the committee for more extensive study and preparation.

I have no way of knowing the immediate reason for the recommendation, but it is an interesting one. Obviously, there exists within certain quarters of the Church the feeling that our present titles are not adequately churchly and impressive to the offices which they represent. It is also possible to assume that some

1 Minutes, page 689.

2 *Bulletin of the Seventeenth Biennial Convention of the ULCA*, page 278 f.

persons might be thinking beyond the matter of titles to what Kant was wont to call *Das Ding an Zich.*

If the resolution is motivated only by a concern for more impressive titles for our officials, certainly there can be no finer mine in which to dig than in that organization with which, unfortunately, too many of our clergy are so happily associated. It doesn't take too much imagination to see what some of our "lodge-happy" pastors might produce with that endeavor. Nor should we hesitate, if the needs seems strong enough, to allow ourselves the privilege of innovation. A brief glance at the titles of the church officials in many sections of Germany would be sufficient to justify any invention. Here is a real museum of ecclesiastical titles: *General-Superintendent, Landes-superintendent, Oberhofprediger, Senior, Landesbischof.*[3] It must soon become apparent that only one term can be considered—that of "bishop."

Certainly the term is a familiar one. Even rabid Presbyterians are forced to admit its antiquity; the pages of Scripture are not unknown to the term. In practice one finds it in usage in the Roman, Eastern (both Uniate and Orthodox, though in somewhat variant form), Anglican and Methodist Churches, certain sects, and of course in certain portions of the Lutheran Church in Europe. Albeit, in each of the aforementioned communions its usage is based, more or less, upon totally different precepts. It is interesting to observe that among these variations, the Methodist bishop is perhaps the most autocratic of all bishops. No prelate in any church wields quite the power that he does.

But to use the term "bishop" without regard for its history is to assume titles. Certainly the term implies more than a high-sounding form of address for an ecclesiastical official. Simply to commence addressing our synodical president as bishop and our church president as archbishop is to be marked with the stamp of externalism . . . a fate even the most intense high-churchman would not relish. For example, consider the possibility of the president of the Pittsburgh Synod being addressed and titled as bishop,

3 Kramm, H. H., *The Theology of Martin Luther* (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1947), page 88.

only to have him relinquish the office at the expiration of his term, and assume his former title as pastor. Actually, if one holds with the presbyteral system the change would not be ludicrous, but only a very patent example of the parity of ministers, the equating of the New Testament terms of bishop and presbyter. But to the rest of the Christian world the situation would seem amusing—another Lutheran peculiarity. Better no bishops!

It seems proper to remember that the term bishop historically presupposes an episcopal system, or at least a modified form of an already existing episcopal system. Our problem therefore is: what is, and what can be the relation of such a system to the Lutheran Church?

I should like to note parenthetically, that it is not the purpose of this paper to investigate the origins of either the presbyteral, episcopal, or congregational forms of church polity, nor do I wish to state the premises of that ever smoldering battle of presbyterianism versus episcopalism. It is not the purpose of this paper to debate the question (if question there be) of the parity of ministers.

In a recent essay, "The Ministry in the Early Church," the Anglican scholar, Dom Gregory Dix, has this to say about historical scholarship:

> It is true that all history, both secular and religious—and not the least the history of the twenty-five years since Versailles in both departments—abounds in demonstrations that it is not only foolish but fatal to pretend to solve the difficulties of the present without a clear understanding of their causes in the past. But it is no less true that present difficulties always contain some novel elements which the practical statesman may rightly emphasize, and with which the rigid traditionalist cannot deal adequately by the appeal to precedent alone. If the first step to a solution lies in a right historical understanding, the second lies in a clear discrimination between past and present. Both are duties of the historian, and the second is only a little less pressing than the first. It is unfortunate that it should have been somewhat neglected in much of the modern discussion of the ancient evidences of the ministry.[4]

4 Kirk, K. E., *The Apostolic Ministry* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., 1947), page 288.

With these significant words as a guide let us proceed to the evidence, and in true Lutheran practice, to the Holy Scriptures. The word "bishop" occurs in the New Testament five times (I Timothy 3:1, 2, Titus 1:7, and Philippians 1:7),[5] with St. Luke (Acts 1:20) making use of the term "bishopric" in the reference to the Psalm (69:25). In not one of these references is there any evidence to indicate who or what a bishop is, or what his ecclesiastical function. The Scriptures offer no solution.

Our next piece of evidence must be the confessional writings of the *Book of Concord,* since we are bound to none of the decisions of the Councils save the three ecumenical creeds and they do not touch upon church order. But it is precisely in this period, from the Apostolic age to the Reformation, that the whole episcopal development takes place, and in turn the bishop is a community pastor surrounded by his council of presbyters and deacons, a provincial patriarch, and, under the obedience of the Roman pontiff, a feudal monarch.

The general tenor of the Confessions is one of antipathy towards the bishops, but not so much because of a disavowal of the episcopal system as such. I have yet to find one reference in the *Book of Concord* which denounces the system itself. Rather the emphasis is upon the holders of the episcopal office, against the persons of the bishops who refuse to accept the teachings of evangelical Christianity and cling to the superstition of Rome.

Article XXVIII of the *Augustana* treats of the abuse of ecclesiastical power, and three significant points should be noted here.

> But this is their (our teachers) opinion, that the power of the Keys, or the power of the bishops, is a power of commandment of God, to preach the Gospel, to remit and retain sins, and to administer sacraments.

> When therefore a question arises concerning the jurisdiction of bishops, civil authority must be distinguished from ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Again, according to the Gospel . . . to the bishops as bishops . . . no jurisdiction belongs, except to forgive sins, to discern doctrine, to reject doctrines con-

5 I have deliberately omitted the reference in I Peter 2:25 since the term here refers not to man, but to Christ.

trary to the Gospel, and to exclude from the communion of the Church wicked men whose wickedness is known, and this without human force, simply by the word.

When they teach or ordain anything against the Gospel, then the congregations have a commandment of God prohibiting obedience. . . . And Augustine (*Contra Petiliani Epistolam*): "Not even to catholic bishops must we submit, if they chance to err, to hold anything contrary to the canonical scriptures of God."

Now it is not our design to wrest the government from the bishops, but this one thing is asked, namely, that they allow the Gospel to be purely taught, and that they relax some few observances which cannot be kept without sin. But if they make no concession, it is for them to see how they shall give account to God for having, by their obstinacy, caused a schism.[6]

It is the bishop's duty to be a pastor in the church, preaching, celebrating the sacraments, hearing confessions and absolving. If he will but do this, the obedience of the faithful will be his.

With the remaining confessional writings the substance is much the same. The present order will be retained if the bishops will but be faithful to the Word.

Furthermore, we wish here again to testify that we will gladly maintain ecclesiastical and canonical order, provided only the bishops cease to rage against our churches.[7]

The bishops have no right, divine or human, to bind the consciences of men by their own invention. There is only one obedience—the Word.[8]

It is only in the *Smalcald Articles* that the question of the equality of bishops and elders is met with, and, in connection with the question of presbyteral ordination, is discussed in two articles.

Jerome therefore teaches that it is by human authority that the grades of bishop and elder or pastor are distinct. And the subject itself declare this,

6 Jacobs, H. E. (ed.), *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1911), page 61.

7 *Ibid.*, page 217 (Apology, Ch. VII, Art. XIV).

8 *Ibid.*, page 295 ff. (Apology, Ch. XIV, Art. XXVIII).

because the power (the office and command) is the same. . . . But one matter afterwards made a distinction between bishops and pastors, viz., ordination, because it was so arranged that one bishop might ordain pastors in a number of churches.

But since by divine authority the grades of bishop and pastor are not diverse, it is manifest that ordination by a pastor in his own church has been appointed by divine law (if a pastor in his own church ordain certain suitable persons to the ministry, such ordination, is, according to divine law, undoubtedly effective and right).

Therefore when the regular bishops become enemies of the Church, or are unwilling to administer ordination, the churches retain their own right. . . .[9]

Also in Part III, Article X:

If the bishops were true bishops and would devote themselves to the Church and the Gospel, they might be allowed for the sake of love and unity, and not from necessity, to ordain and confirm us and our preachers; nevertheless, under the condition that all masks and phantoms (deceptions, absurdities, and appearances) of unchristian nature and display be laid aside. Yet because they neither are nor wish to be true bishops, but worldly lords and princes, who will neither preach nor teach, nor baptize, nor administer the Lord's Supper, nor perform any work or office of the Church, but persecute and condemn those who being called discharge this duty; for their sake the Church ought not to remain without ministers.

Therefore as the ancient examples of the Church and the Fathers teach us, we ourselves will and ought to ordain suitable persons to this office. . . .[10]

We may gather from the Confessions, as from the writings of Luther himself, that the choice was a simple one: retain a church with the episcopacy, but with wrong doctrine, or establish a church with pure doctrine, but without the episcopacy. The choice was an easy one. Luther, true to his Augustinian background wherein faith was of far greater import than order, chose the latter. This does not mean that Luther was opposed to the episcopacy. It was

9 *Ibid.*, page 349. For a modern interpretation on the reference to Jerome, see Kirk, K. E., *op. cit.*, 326 ff.

10 *Ibid.*, page 333 f.

his intention not to abolish the episcopate, but to reform it. Originally he had hoped to unite all of Germany in an episcopal constitution under a German primate, the archbishop of Mainz, and thus develop an independent German Episcopal Church, similar in order to the Church of England. This the archbishop and most of the bishops of Germany refused to accept although Luther continued to try to win the primate as late as 1530.[11]

When it became apparent that the plan was never to succeed, it became a territorial matter. Where a Roman bishop accepted the Gospel, it was Luther's desire to continue him in his see, thus continuing the church along episcopal lines. This was the case in what is now East Prussia, where for some years the Lutheran Church had a series of consecrated bishops. Where, however, there was no success in winning the existing ordinary over, Luther and his followers, true to their principles of pure doctrine, ordained their own pastors and established them under the office of "superintendent"—a name which Luther disliked and for which he continued to use "bishop."[12]

Thus for the Church of the Augsburg Confession in the land of its birth there existed a whole host of ecclesiastical constitutions, the episcopacy flourished alongside consistories, superintendents, princes and theological faculties. In the Scandinavian countries there was also diversity, Norway and Denmark retaining in some measure the old titles but accepting a government regulated by superintendents and consistories made up of theological professors. In Sweden and Finland the "Episcopal Succession" was retained, although Finland was forced by action of the Russian government in the nineteenth century to continue a "priestly succession." In recent times however the church in Finland (and in some Baltic countries) has recovered the episcopal succession by the assistance of the Primate of Sweden at the consecration of bishops of those churches.

Since the time of the Reformation the matter of the episcopal form of government has largely been dismissed by Lutheran the-

11 Kramm, H. H., *op. cit.*, page 88 f.
12 *Ibid.*

ologians and church officials as something unnecessary and unimportant. Certainly German pietism and its development throughout the church had much to do with that. In fact, one might almost go so far as to say that there has been an almost deliberate attempt to belittle the episcopal system. This may be the result of the continued discussion of the matter by Anglican theologians; it may also be the result of the growing number of the discussions concerning faith and order in the present endeavor of the churches to consider ecumenical oneness. This "belittling" is summed up in the statement of a Swedish theologian, a statement, incidentally, which has come to be an accepted view of many Lutherans, even though it is not an official one.

> We (some Scandinavian Churches) have the succession as though we possessed it not. . . . In our eyes it is, I should almost say, unworthy of the ministers of Christ to make the possession of the apostolic succession a condition for intercommunion.[13]

What is the reaction of episcopal Christianity to this position? Among Roman Catholics the matter is far deeper than church order. As the Vatican pointed out in its reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent critique of the proposed doctrine of the Assumption: it is still a matter of admission of papal supremacy. With the Anglicans it is a different story. The difference between Rome and Canterbury on the matter is neatly demonstrated in this word of Cardinal Newman:

> (Roman) Catholics believe their orders are valid because they belong to the true Church; Anglicans believe they belong to the true Church because their orders are valid.[14]

Strangely enough we must take a position which parallels that

13 Molland, E., "The Possibility of a United Christendom from the Scandinavian Standpoint," in *Union of Christendom,* K. Mackenzie (ed.), 1938, page 445. Shortly after this paper was written, the writer had an opportunity to hear an address by the Rev. Dr. Gunnar Rosendahl, of Osby, Sweden. Dr. Rosendahl is the head of the Catholic Revival movement in the Church of Sweden and represents the other side of Dr. Molland's quotation. For more on him see *The Living Church,* October 22, 1950.

14 Quoted in Kirk, K. E., *op. cit.,* page 30, note 2.

of Rome: Lutherans believe their orders are of little import because they have the true faith and hence are in the true church. But to return to our question, what is the reaction of non-Roman episcopalism? Among the many schools of the Church of England the Anglo-Catholic group is making great effort to prove the episcopacy to be of divine right, not simply as a governing order, but as the *only, true* and *essential* ministry upon which the entire Church depends. This is carefully set forth, though not without some scholastic gymnastics, in an excellent volume edited by the Bishop of Oxford, the Rt. Rev. Kenneth E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry.* The work is a collection of essays on "the history and doctrine of the episcopacy." One of the essays, entitled "Sidelights from the Neo-episcopal Communions," contains two sections on Lutheranism and its peculiar tradition. The following is of interest:

> Lutheranism is a protest against the mechanical view of salvation guaranteed by the Apostolic Succession and the Keys of St. Peter. These are indeed important; but if they were made the sole touchstone of Catholicism a protest is certainly needed. It is a matter of necessity that bishops should be in the true line of succession, and immensely desirable that they should be in communion with the presidential see of Rome. But when some men speak as though the one test of Catholicism were to be in communion with the Holy See, and others seem to think that nothing matters except the possession of valid order, it is well for them to be reminded that both unity and order exist for the sake of Faith, and that if it is distorted neither unity nor order is of much value. . . . The stress laid by the Lutherans on purity of doctrine, and on the responsibility of the whole Church in this matter, is their principal contribution to a true view of the ministry. We should not wish to follow them in their one-sided emphasis on justification by faith alone; nor in their scrupulous fears lest any practice or teaching should be admitted which might open the door to derogation of that dangerous doctrine; nor in their treatment of the Apostolic Succession as a thing indifferent: but their contention that the ministry exists as much to preserve and proclaim the Gospel as to administer the sacraments is something we need to take to heart.[15]

To sum up, if we are faithful to our confessions there is only one conclusion: episcopacy is *a* system, it is not *the* system.

15 Kirk, K. E., *op. cit.*, page 478 f.

What then shall we say concerning the problem? Can the Lutheran Church in America even consider the possibility of adopting the episcopate?

To be sure there are many who would object. Too many see in the episcopal system a side road which once gotten upon leads to the establishment of the episcopacy, not *iure humano,* but *iure divino,* thus allowing the completely mechanical concept of salvation to arise. This view is set forth in the textbook, *Popular Symbolics,* prepared by four scholars of the Missouri Synod.

> The Catholic view that ordination is a sacrament instituted by Christ imparting the Holy Spirit, the power of forgiving sins by the right of the priesthood and of effecting the sacraments and the character *indelebilis* deals with myths throughout . . . the Catholic and Episcopal Churches that the episcopal ordination by virtue of the Apostolic Succession confers "holy orders" deals with two additional myths. The holy order of sacerdotalism does not exist, and there are no bishops *iure divino.* Furthermore, Ananias, who put his hand on Paul was neither an Apostle or a bishop, Acts 9:17. And they who performed the ceremony of the laying on of hands in the case of Timothy were simple presbyters, elders, pastors, I Timothy 4:14.[16]

But let us look at the other side, and, in so doing, proceed in the spirit of Gregory Dix's quotation on historical study. Having looked to the past, consider the peculiarities of the future. The growing interest in matters which have to do with liturgics and ceremonial within the Lutheran Church is also concerned with church order, and for persons who are thus inclined there is a strong feeling for a return to the historic episcopate. This, coupled with the fact that any and all discussions of union among Christian communions, by Anglican influence, will contain a statement on episcopacy and its necessity for the church, will give rise to the question: why not episcopacy in the Lutheran Church?

It is, and always has been, maintained that the Lutheran Church is the church of the Conservative Reformation. All that was not in harmony with the Gospel has been thrown out; all else in the tradition of the church remains. Where is the episcopacy?

16 Quoted in Kramm, H. H., *op. cit.,* page 90.

Certainly regardless of our interests in the ecumenical movement, any ultimate scheme for church union will demand an episcopal form of church government. Considering that possibility (and let us pray for the day when a positive and inclusive statement of faith can be formulated which does not compromise the true faith), will we Lutherans refuse to join in such a scheme simply because we refuse the notion of the episcopacy? Will the day come when Lutherans will wrangle over an adiaphoron?

This is the question for the church; what is the answer? Permit me once again to refer to the oft-quoted work of Dr. Kramm:

> Thus on principle all priests are bishops. And yet Luther recognized that the individual priest or pastor ought not to have ultimate authority in the Church. The Church would have to think out some way of controlling the doctrine and work of the individual pastors, and the training, examination, and lawful vocation and ordination of candidates to the ministry. As no details are prescribed by God, the Church must try by all means to find out the most suitable form of organization. This organization may change at various times and in various countries according to changing conditions.[17]

I close with this simple word of that sainted pastor and truly great evangelical catholic, Wilhelm Loehe:

> There is a unity—unity in Confession and doctrine, unity of faith; this is the unity intended by the Lord and His Apostles and in it consists the glory of the Church.[18]

17 Kramm, H. H., *op. cit.*, page 87.

18 Loehe, Wilhelm, *Three Books on the Church*, Edward T. Horn (trans.) (Reading, Penna.: Pilger Publishing House, 1908), page 135.

Fifty Years of Biblical Archaeology

C. Umhau Wolf

ARCHAEOLOGY is the study of the material remains of ancient cultures. In its earliest pre-historic phases it is the upward extension of geology and anthropology. In its later phases it both draws to itself and illumines from itself history, literature, art, cultural anthropology, ethnology, philology, and a host of other sciences and humanities.

Biblical archaeology is an "armchair variety" of the science (this term coined by Dr. G. E. Wright, editor of the *Biblical Archaeologist*) which takes the facts of archaeology and relates them to the Bible.[1] In this paper we will not be entirely limited by the chronological or geographical subscriptions of the Old and the New Testaments.

The archaeologist is primarily a scientist and not a treasure hunter or a religious fanatic. He meticulously plans for an excavation, carefully digs, records, classifies and analyzes his results. The task of interpretation is the most hazardous and requires talents of synthesis rare to any one scholar.[2] As such an exact science, archaeology is young—less than a hundred years in reality.[3] The term "archaeology" has been used for at least two thousand years in relation to the Jews, as in Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*. This older use of the term became traditional and it is still used to describe the material culture of past civilizations

1 Burrows, M., "How Archaeology Helps the Student of the Bible," *Biblical Archaeologist,* III, 2, p. 13 ff. Burrows, M., *What Mean These Stones* (New Haven, 1941), Par. 16.

2 For examples of misinterpretation cf. Burrows, M., *What Mean These Stones,* Par. 22, 23, 24.

3 Daniel, G. E., *One Hundred Years of Archaeology* (London, 1950). This is rather weak on Palestine but a wide and comprehensive survey of the present status of general archaeological studies. Compare also on Mesopotamia archaeology, Lloyd, S., *Foundations in the Dust* (London, 1948).

from literary and traditional sources.[4] The broadest use of the term includes this traditional and literary description as well as the excavated remains.[5]

In this mid-century it seemed good to take a backward look at the state of biblical and Palestinian archaeology fifty or sixty years ago as a background for a survey of present results. The anniversary of the American Schools of Oriental Research[6] in the Christmas holidays of 1950 was observed with interesting reminiscences from Dr. Charles Torrey, a leading force in the establishment of American archaeological interest. The German Evangelical Archaeological Institute[7] whose library and museum are now entrusted to the Jerusalem Branch of the Lutheran World Federation will celebrate its anniversary next year.[8] Three other organizations, however, have priority in Palestinian archaeology: the Palestine Exploration Fund,[9] which sent out General Warren and others, founded in 1865; the Deutsche Palaestina Verein,[10] founded in 1877, which, engaged in only one excavation before 1900; and the Ecole Biblique,[11] founded in 1891.

There had been a long process of development before the time had arrived when such organizations could win and sustain

4 Cf. Bissell, E. C., *Biblical Antiquities* (Philadelphia, 1888).

5 Cf. Burrows, *op. cit.* Watzinger, G., *Denkmäler Palästinas,* Leipzig, 1933-1935 (poorly done), Barrois, A. G., *Manuel d'archaeologie biblique* (Paris, 1939), Otto, W., *Handbuch der Archäologie,* 1939-1950.

6 *American Schools of Oriental Research, Anniversary Catalogue,* 1950. An incorporated cooperative body with work in Jerusalem and Baghdad. Its outstanding personalities are Dr. W. E. Albright and President Nelson Glueck, who have been long-time directors of the Jerusalem School. Its publications are the *Annual* (from 1920 on) and the *Bulletin* (from 1920 on, hereafter *BASOR*), and the *Biblical Archaeologist* (from 1938 on, hereafter *BA*), the most important popular survey of the material in any language.

7 Its major figures are Gustav Dalman and Albrecht Alt; the latter is still living. The *Palästina Jahrbuch* is especially valuable for geographical explorations.

8 Would a revival of this organization as a pan-Lutheran agency under Lutheran World Federation be possible at the LWF convention next year? The writer has already taken preliminary steps in this direction. He would be happy to hear of possible interest and support.

9 Published the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* (1869 on) and the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* (from 1881 on).

10 Published the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästinavereins* (from 1878 on).

11 The men who have made a name for this school are Pere Vincent, Pere Abel, Pere Dhorme (no longer in the order) and Pere De Vaux. Published the *Revue Biblique* (from 1892 on).

interest and support.[12] Napoleon, perhaps, did more than he realized to give Europe an eastward vision.[13] The researches of the American, Edward Robinson (1838), were the high point of the first half of the nineteenth century.[14] His topographical research and genius was paralleled but not quite equalled by Tobler and Guerin and by Conder's surveys. He marks the beginning of the science of toponomy developed by G. A. Smith, Pere Abel, and epitomized in the *Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible.*[15]

Throughout the nineteenth century, research in Mesopotamia was going on apace.[16] An approximate correlation of the biblical period of the monarchy with Assyrian and Babylonian records could be made at the turn of the century.[17] The creation stories and the flood epic were well known and formed the basis for much of the literary criticism and *religionsgeschichte* interpretation of the Book of Genesis.[18] This great cuneiform reservoir developed the pan-Babylonian school of archaeology, history, theology, and civilization. Shortly after the turn of the century Breasted[19] and others

12 Cf. Bliss, F. J., *The Development of Palestine Exploration* (London, 1903; New York, 1906). Macallister, R., *A Century of Excavation in Palestine* (London, 1930). Michaelis, *Die Archäologischen Entdeckungen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts,* 1906.

13 Cf. the significance of the Rosetta Stone for the story of Egypt. Cf. the influence on European and American art and architecture—even to the Washington Monuments; cp. Wittler Ecles, "Egyptian Revival in America," *Archaeology,* III, 3, p. 164 ff.

14 *Biblical Researches* (New York, 1841). Cf. the articles on his centenary in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* Vol. 58.

15 Conder, H., *Survey of Western Palestine* (with Warren, Kitchener and others), three volumes, *Survey of Eastern Palestine* (London, 1889). Tobler, T., *Topographie von Jerusalem,* and *Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae,* and *Bibliographia Geographica Palestinae.* Smith, G. A., *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land,* 25th ed., 1932. Pere F. M. Abel, *Geographie de la Palestine,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1938); a new edition is expected next year. Wright and Filson, *Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1945).

16 Cf. Lloyd, S., *op. cit.,* Hilprecht, H. V., *Exploration in Bible Lands during the 19th Century* (Edinburgh, 1903).

17 Price, I. M., *The Monuments and the Old Testament,* 1899; Clay, A., *Light on the Old Testament From Babel,* 1907; Schrader, E., *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament,* 2 vols., 2nd Edition (German), 1885, English Translation, 1888.

18 Cf. Driver, S. R., in Hogarth, *Authority and Archaeology: Sacred and Profane,* 1899, and his *The Bible as Illustrated by the Monuments,* 1909. Cf. Sayce, *The Verdict of the Monuments* and the volumes in the previous note. For a summary of the bibliography and a good treatment of the relationship, cf. Heidel, A., *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago, 1942, 2nd ed., 1951), p. 2. Also Heidel, A., *The Gilgamesh Epic and the Old Testament* (Chicago, 1945).

19 Cf. his swan song in *The Dawn of Civilization* (Chicago, 1932).

tried to swing the pendulum in the other direction and to make Egypt the source of all things high and noble. Today, with more resources and a more adequate scientific method since 1930, there has been achieved a rather cautious balance.[20]

The youthfulness of the science of archaeology in the Holy Land is revealed by a study of the material at hand from that area at the turn of the century. Of major inscriptions we have the Eshmun'azer sarcophagus from Sidon (found 1855), the Mesha' Stone (discovered 1868), the Siloam Inscription (found 1880), the Amarna letters (uncovered from 1887 on) and the Mernephtah stele (found in 1897). In those early days forgeries were frequent and some were only slowly recognized as such.[21] Outside of the topographic explorations there were only four major areas of excavation in Palestine-Syria before 1900: Tell el Hesi, excavated by Petri and Bliss and taken to be Lachish; Jerusalem and Ophel dug variously by Warren, Bliss, and Guthe; several mounds in the Shephelah unearthed by Bliss and Macallister; and Zendjirli excavated by Von Luschan.[22]

Petri's discovery of sequence dating of pottery[23] at Tell el Hesi in 1891, utilizing the recognition of stratification in ancient sites by Schleimann at Troy, marks the beginning of scientific archaeology.[24] Even the monumental finds of Mesopotamia and Egypt during the nineteenth century have to take a back seat to the lowly potsherd, as archaeology got out of its swaddling clothes and took Paul Bunyan strides forward. It is almost an impossible

20 Cf. the caution of Gordon Childe in the prefaces to his many books, "in the present state of our knowledge."

21 Even the Mesha' Stone was for a time suspect. Cf. McCown, C., *The Ladder of Progress in Palestine* (New York, 1943), p. 342 ff.

22 Petrie, F., *Tell el-Hesy* (London, 1891), Bliss, F., *Mound of Many Cities* (London, 1894). Bliss, E., *Excavations at Jerusalem* (London, 1898), Bliss and Macalister, *Excavations in Palestine During the Years 1898-1900* (London, 1902).

23 Cf. Petri, F., *op. cit.* The clearest study of stratification is in Chapter IV, "Mounds of Many Cities," by Cyrus Gordan, *The Living Past* (New York, 1941). For a more detailed survey, chapter I, "The Art of Excavating a Palestinian Mound," by W. F. Albright in *The Archaeology of Palestine* (London, 1949). It is the writer's hope to be able to find an opportunity to meet the needs of the middle ground student.

24 His obituary in *BA* V, 3, p. 33, and *BASOR* 87, p. 6 ff.

task to make even a cursory study of the history of Palestinian archaeology during the past fifty-eight years.[25]

Megiddo was first excavated by the Germans from 1903-1905[26] and was to become the exemplar site under the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago from 1925 on.[27] The great mound of Tell es Sultan (identified with Old Testament Jericho) was excavated by Sellin and Watzinger in 1907 and following years.[28] It was renewed in 1929-1936 by Garstang[29] and a third excavation is scheduled for the fall of 1951 by Miss Kenyon.

The American excavation at Samaria, which brought to the fore Reisner and Fischer as leading archaeologists began in 1908.[30] It is one of the few Palestinian sites where some attention was paid to materials of Roman and later times. Until the thirties, Palestinian archaeologists customarily and summarily dumped Arab, Byzantine, Roman, and even Hellenistic remains in order quickly to go deeper for the supposedly more spectacular Iron and Bronze ages.[31] Samaria was also restudied from 1931-1933.[32]

After World War I the work of Garrod, McCown, and Mallon gave a great impetus to prehistoric study in Palestine.[33] From 1926-1932 emerged the figure of the world's greatest living ar-

25 Cf. chapter 2 in W. F. Albright *AP,* or the older account in Barton, G., *Archaeology and the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1933), chapters 1-4, or Wright and Filson, *Westminster Atlas,* pp. 103 ff.

26 Schumacher, G., and Steuernagel, C., *Tell El Mutesellim,* 1908.

27 Cf. Bibliography in *BA* XIII, 2 p. 23.

28 Sellin, E., and Watzinger, C., *Jericho,* 1913.

29 Garstang, J., *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (Liverpool, 1932-1936), and *The Story of Jericho,* 1940.

30 Reisner, Fischer, and Lyon, *Harvard Excavation at Samaria 1908-1910* (Cambridge, Mass., 1924). Obituary for Reisner, *BASOR* 87, p. 8 ff. and for Fischer in *BA* IV, 3, p. 48.

31 *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis,* edited by C. Kraeling (New Haven, 1938), and last year's excavation of New Testament Jericho, *BASOR* 120, p. 11, both by the ASOR, are the only other major Roman digs in Palestine. Numerous tombs, synagogues, and churches have been studied but pottery and other small artifacts have too often been neglected.

32 Crowfoot, J. W., Kenyon, K., and Sukenik, E. L., *The Buildings at Samaria,* 1942; cf. McCown, *op. cit.,* chap. XIII.

33 An adequate survey in McCown, *op. cit.,* chaps. II-VI and corresponding bibliographies.

chaeologist, Dr. W. F. Albright, working at Tell Beit Mirsim.[34] This site, although not startling in discoveries or significant in biblical history, has become the classic site on methodology and chronology.[35] The amazing discoveries by the French at Ras Shamra since 1929 and at Mari since 1933 have changed the face of biblical archaeology.[36] An outstanding excavation was conducted by the late Starkie at Tell ed Duweer, more correctly identified as Lachish, from 1932-1938.[37] From 1933-1943 Nelson Glueck, following in the footsteps of another American, Edward Robinson a hundred years earlier, made topographical surveys of Transjordan and engaged in several important excavations.[38] The period of World War II saw a synthesis of the materials and the publication of several volumes which will remain invaluable for some time to come.[39] A new start was made in 1950-1951 by Kelso at Tell Abu el Alayiq (New Testament Jericho)[40] and Tell en-Nitla (Byzantine Gilgal),[41] by Sallers of the Franciscans at

34 Cf. the volumes in the Annuals of the ASOR, XII, XIII, XVII, XXI-XXII. A tribute to his leadership is found in the commemorative number of the *BASOR*, 122, April, 1951.

35 Cf. McCown, *op. cit.*, chap. VII; cf. Wright's estimate of this comparatively inexpensive venture with the elaborate Megiddo expeditions in *BA* XIII, 2, and *Journal of American Oriental Society*, 70, pp. 56-60.

36 The publications on these sites and the cuneiform tablets from both are too numerous to begin to mention. The Ras Shamra material is available to English readers through the work of Cyrus Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook* (Rome, 1947), 3 vols., and *Ugaritic Literature* (Rome, 1949), a translation. The original material published by C. F. Schaeffer is in the French *Syria* (1929 on). Additional bibliography will be found in the books listed under the sections of this article on Literary Criticism and Interpretation (n. 174). The tablets from Mari are less than a fourth published. The results are largely published by A. Parrot in *Syria* (1935 on) and in the newly established *Studia Marianna*.

37 Torczyner, *Lachish I* (the Letters), and Tufnell, Inge, and Harding, *Lachish II*, 1940.

38 Explorations in Eastern Palestine, ASOR, XIV, XV, XVIII-XIX, and XXV-XXVIII. Cp. *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, 1940).

39 The charts by Eliot, *Excavations in Mesopotamia and Western Iran 4000-500 B. C.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950); Perkins, A., *Comparative Archaeology of Early Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1949); Noth, M., *Die Welt des Alten Testament*, 1940; and an encyclopaedic work not yet fully assimilated, C. Shaeffer, *Les Stratigraphie Comparee*, 1948; Burrows, *op. cit.;* McCown, *op. cit.;* Finegan, J., *Light From the Ancient Past*, 1946; Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 1940, and *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, 1942.

40 *BASOR* 120, p. 11 ff., *BA* XIII, 2, p. 48.

41 *BASOR* 121, p. 6 ff.

Bethany,[42] by DeVaux of the Dominicans at Tell el Farah (supposed Tirzeh,[43] and by Albright at Qataban.[44] The results of Winnett at Dhibon have not been published in a preliminary account as yet. Schaeffer and Dumont are back again at Ugarit and Byblos respectively. New techniques of dating, perhaps as significant for the second half of the century as Petri's sequence dating for the first half, are to be seen in the study of the radio-activity of the carbon atom.[45]

ARCHAEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL HISTORY

Archaeology largely illustrates, complements, and fills in the background and gaps in biblical history. Since the Bible is primarily a religious document,[46] it is now recognized to be incomplete and didactic historiagrapha. Many interesting events and outstanding persons have been omitted. Many movements of interest to the cultural historian are ignored or casually alluded to. Thus the history of music is glossed over in less than a verse.[47] The great urban revolution is perhaps to be sought under the allusions to Cain as a dweller in cities.[48] The importance of the introduction of iron[49] is behind the cultural conflict between Saul and the Philistines. The great Hurrian civilization appears as a mysterious name in the biblical lists.[50] Ahab appears more important than his father Omri,

42 *La Terra Santa,* August, 1950, p. 225 ff.

43 *Revue Biblique,* 1947, 1948, and excavations continued last year.

44 *BASOR* 119, p. 5 ff.

45 *BA* XIV 1, p. 25 f. and 31.

46 Cf. the present resurgence of theological interpretation of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament. Cf. James Smart, "The Death and Rebirth of Old Testament Theology," *The Journal of Religion,* January, April, 1943, Vol. XXIII, Nos. 1 and 2. Also William Denton, *Preface to Old Testament Theology* (New Haven, 1950).

47 Genesis 4:21. Cp. *BA* IV, 3, p. 33 f.

48 Cf. Genesis 4:17. Gordon Childe, *What Happened in History* (London: Pelican, 1942), chapter V.

49 James Kelso in note 75 in W. F. Albright, "The Biblical Period" in *The Jews: Their History and Culture,* edited by Finkelstein (Cambridge, Mass., 1949), a privately printed article in 1950 and hereafter noted as *BP,* p. 59.

50 Bissell, E. C., *op. cit.,* p. 13. Cf. "Until recently the biblical Horites were just as obscure as the Hittites had been fifty years earlier." WFA in *The Jewish People: Past and Present,* vol. I (New York, 1946), p. 31. Hereafter this volume is *JPP* and each article designated by author's initials. W. F. Albright, "Israel in the Framework of

the founder of the dynasty and builder of Samaria, because of the theological implications of his connections with Elijah and Jezebel. The great blank in the intertestamental period is only slowly being filled in.

The study of archaeology has in the main contributed to the historicity of the biblical record and to its general authenticity.[51] For the most part this is indirect evidence, but nevertheless it is valuable. Parrot at Mari did not find Abraham, but he could exclaim, "Almost."[52] There have been many adequate surveys of the relationship between archaeology and history and this study does not wish, nor does space permit any reduplication. Some surveys are arranged on the basis of the biblical books.[53] Others are chronologically arranged.[54] A few are analytical in their organization.[55]

The history of Israel begins, according to the Bible, with father Abraham,[56] although some scholars would begin with the Exodus or the Conquest.[57] However, history in the sense of man's existence on this earth had begun long before Abraham.[58] The development of Neolithic civilization on the basis of the discovery of pottery and the gradual establishment of village culture is well attested throughout the ancient Near East. In the Chalcolithic period, history in the sense of written records (*'istoria*) is to be

the Ancient Near East," E. L. Sukenik, "History of Jewish Archaeology," A. Menes, "History of the Jews in Ancient Times." Cf. also A. E. Speiser, *Introduction to Hurrian, AASOR* XX.

51 Wright, G. E., "Recent European Study in the Pentateuch," in *Journal of Bible and Religion,* October, 1950, XVIII, No. 4, p. 216 f.

52 WFA in *JPP,* I, p. 30.

53 E. Schrader, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (London, 1888); G. Barton, *op. cit.,* part II; Albright in *Old Testament Commentary,* edited by Alleman and Flack (Philadelphia, 1948), pp. 134-170.

54 Finegan, J., *Light From the Ancient Past* (Princeton, 1946); Grezzman, H., *Altorientalische Bilder zum Alten Testament* (Berlin, 1927); the three articles in *JPP,* Vol. I; Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*

55 Barton, G., *op. cit.,* Part I; Otto, W., *op. cit.;* Burrows, M., *op. cit.;* Pritchard, J., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (Princeton, 1950).

56 *BP,* p. 4 f.

57 Cf. Noth, M., *Die Geschichte Israels,* 1950, and works of Von Rad. Even this is a far cry from the position seventy-five years ago when the later monarchy was the reference point along with Amos.

58 Childe, G., *op. cit.,* chap. II; McCown, C., *op. cit.,* chaps. 3, 4, 5, 6; Bailey, A. E., *Daily Life in Bible Times* (New York, 1943), chap. 1; WFA in *AP,* chap. 3.

recognized. About 3400 B. C. writing seems to have been established in Southern Mesopotamia and shortly thereafter in Egypt, and perhaps India.

The story of the flood is almost universal in ethnology,[59] but the concentration of civilizations in the Lower Mesopotamia valley suggests such a locale for the biblical story. The Gilgamesh Epic was known before the turn of the century and was frequently related to the Noachin deluge. Between the two wars, archaeological evidence of floods of catastrophic dimensions were discovered at Ur, Kish, Fara, and elsewhere.[60] The relation of the Tower of Babel to the ziggurats is still a live subject.[61]

The first great civilizations, historical in the sense of developed cultures with cities, fire, pottery, writing, bronze and commerce, appear during the second millenium B. C. In Egypt this includes the Pyramid Age and in Mesopotamia the Sumerian and Accadian civilizations. Palestine of this period has also emerged from the shadows in the last fifty years.[62] The land of the Bible was already a developed country with flourishing cities as evidenced by Ghassul, Jericho, Beth-Shan, Megiddo, Beth Yerah, etc. In the first half of this period there is evidence for trade and commerce with Egypt, while the second half is more largely dominated by Mesopotamian culture. This Palestinian bridge saw frequent alternations of influence as well as of political domination.

With Abraham, archaeology and biblical history become partners in the development of a consistent story which becomes more and more complete each successive month.[63] The Hebrew tradition concerning the origin of the patriarchal family is no longer to be considered artificial. "Archaeological discoveries of the past generation have changed all this. Aside from a few die-hards among older scholars, there is scarcely a single biblical historian who has

59 Frazer's method of assembling data in *Folklore of the Old Testament* (London, 1918).

60 The latest using Price and Nelson and others is Rehwinckel, *The Flood Story* (St. Louis, 1951). For a sane critique of the problem see *BA* V, 4, p. 55 ff.

61 A. Parrot, *Ziggurats et Tour de Babel* (Paris, 1949).

62 WFA in *AP* chap. 4; cf. G. E. Wright, *The Pottery of Palestine* (New Haven, 1937).

63 H. H. Rowley, *Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age* (Manchester, 1949).

not been impressed by the rapid accumulation of data supporting the substantial historicity of patriarchal tradition."[64] Personal names,[65] allusions to thriving cities, designated ethnic movements, contemporaneous domestic and legal customs, parallel religious beliefs all contribute to the understanding of the age of the patriarchs.

The sensational discoveries at Mari[66] and at Nuzu[67] make the culture of the patriarchs more real than that of almost any pre-Roman culture.[68] The Amorites are now a well known and well-defined people.[69] Even Sodom and Gomorrah have come into their own in archaeological and geological researches at the southern end of the Dead Sea.[70] Only Genesis 14 seems to be an unravelled puzzle. But, "As a whole, the picture in Genesis is historical and there is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the biographical details and the sketches of personality which make the patriarchs come alive with a vividness unknown to a single extra-biblical character in the whole vast literature of the ancient Near East."[71]

The great movements of the Hurrians,[72] the "Hyksos,"[73] and the Hittites[74] supplement and fill in the historical background for the age of Isaac and Jacob. The Hittites were rediscovered during the nineteenth century but much of the material has been and still is being deciphered and interpreted in the twentieth. Archaeology likewise indicates the flow of traffic throughout the fertile crescent during this time.[75] Egypt seems to have been the dominant political power after the fall of the first Babylonian

64 WFA in *BP*, p. 3; cf. WFA in *JPP*, vol. I, p. 30.

65 WFA in *JPP*, I, 30, 31, 33, 36, etc.

66 *BASOR*, 77, p. 20 f.; 78, p. 23 f. Popular article, "Mari," by George Mendenhall in *BA* XI, 1, p. 1 f. Continuing in *Studia Mariana*, Leyden.

67 Cf. *Excavations at Nuzi* (Cambridge, Mass.), 5 vols.

68 C. Gordan in *BA* III, 1, p. 1 ff., and in his *Living Past*, Chap. VIII; popular reconstruction of life in Bailey, *op. cit.*, chaps. I and II.

69 R. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim* (Rome, 1948). Cf. WFA in *JPP*, 1, 29 ff.

70 *BA* V, 2, p. 17 f., and VI, 3, 41 ff.

71 WFA in *BP*, p. 6.

72 O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*, p. 55 f. Speiser, A., "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millenium B. C.," *AASOR*, XIII, p. 13 f.

73 W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, pp. 150-155. WFA in *JPP*, I, p. 35.

74 WFA in *JPP*, I, p. 33; cf. works of Hrozny, Gelb, Goetze, etc.; E. Cavaignac, *Les Hittites* (Paris, 1950).

75 WFA in *JPP*, I, p. 35.

dynasty.[76] The story of the sojourn and of Joseph is more plausible through the re-study of the well-known Amarna Age.[77] The wall paintings in Egypt indicate frequent descent of Syrian tribes into the more prosperous Misraim.[78] Excavation in Palestine reveals that these ethnic movements involved that land also.[79]

The figure of Moses is so dominant and integral a part of the tradition of Israel that he can hardly be a figment of the imagination.[80] The personal names, the archaeological history of Pithom and Tanis (Rameses), the widespread literary activity, the monotheism of Akhnaton and the great high gods of Canaan and Mesopotamia, and the developed law codes of the Near East all combine to give an authentic flavor to the substantial figure of Moses. Although the Habiru and 'apiru are not yet nailed down with finality, their connection with the wandering Israelites is definite.[81]

The relationship of Moses to the conquest of Canaan is still a problem, as is his relation to Joshua. But the fact of the conquest is indisputable.[82] The destruction of the cities, including Jericho, Bethshemesh, Bethshan, Tell Beit Mirsim, Megiddo, Lachish, and the consequent rise of a new culture with lime cisterns and with a notable reduction in fertility cult object, are direct testimonies to the gradual conquest of Palestine by Israel as narrated in the Book of Judges.[83] The surface explorations of Moab and Edom by Nelson Glueck[84] make contemporaneous with the conquest the first settlements of these related cultures in Transjordan which are interdicting the passage of Israel in the biblical tradition. Joshua is hardly any less an historical figure than Moses.[85]

76 WFA in *AP*, chap. V.

77 Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, p. 27 ff.; Bailey, *op. cit.*, chap. IV.

78 Pritchard, "Syrians in Egypt," *BASOR*, 122, p. 36 f.

79 WFA in *BP*, p. 14.

80 H. Gressman, *Moses und Seine Zeit* (Berlin, 1914).

81 Speiser, *AASOR*, XIII; WFA in *BP*, p. 15; WFA, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (hereafter ARI), p. 200. For a complete bibliography, cf. H. H. Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua* (London, 1950).

82 Rowley in volume noted above in note 81 has an excellent survey of the exodus and conquest. Cf. *BASOR*, 85, p. 27 ff.

83 *BA* I, 2, p. 5 f.; VI, 1, p. 1 ff.; *JBL*, 60, p. 27 ff.; WFA in *JPP*, I, p. 43.

84 *AASOR*, XV, XVIII-XIX, XXV-XXVIII; popular summary in *BA*, X, 4, p. 77 ff.

85 WFA in *BP*, p. 16.

The Wen Amun chronicle suggests the lessening of Egyptian control over Syro-Palestine. The absorption of Canaanite cities into the amphictionic state was to become a source of religious strife in the days of the kings, but the tradition of Shechem seems correct. The arrival of the Philistines in archaeology dovetails with their settlement in the Old Testament stories.[86] There are still problems, of course, to be solved concerning the exodus and the conquest. . . . "However, we are much better off than we were a quarter century ago. The progress of excavation and of philological interpretation of inscriptions has made it absolutely certain, in the writer's judgment, that the principal phase of the Conquest must be dated in the thirteenth century, probably in the second half of that century."[87]

The rise of the monarchy is greatly clarified by recent archaeological discovery and interpretation. The beginnings under Saul are unpretentious as suggested by the Bible and by the rude palace-fortress of Gibea.[88] The many sites excavated from this period elaborate the vague hint of 1 Samuel 13:20-21 that a new age was dawning with the increased influence of the Hittites and the Philistines: i.e., the Iron Age. The fortifications at Bethshemesh and of Tell Beit Mirsim indicate the increased strength of the monarchy under David in view of Philistine threats. There is even some possibility that the Jebusite wall of Jerusalem has been discovered.[89] The relation of the rising monarchy with the developing Aramean powers has been carefully chronicled by archaeological studies.[90]

Much of the debunking of the glory which was Solomon's has had to be retracted in the face of increased archaeological witness to his greatness. More careful synchronization of the kingdoms of the ancient Near East indicate that Solomon's age was propitious in that no other major power appeared as a formidable

86 WFA in *AP*, p. 113 f.

87 WFA in *BP*, p. 15, Wright and Filson, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 f., 43 f.; Rowley, volume in note 81 *passim.*

88 *AASOR*, IV.

89 Macalister and Duncan, *Annual Palestine Exploration Fund*, IV; Crowfoot and Fitzgerald, *APEF*, V. Cf. McCown, *op. cit.*, chap. XV.

90 O'Callaghan, *op. cit.*; cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Araméens* (Paris, 1949).

rival to him to the north, south, or east.[91] As defense against possible petty aggressors, Solomon is reputed to have developed a strong standing army, including many charioteers. The excavation of Megiddo by the Oriental Institute has not only uncovered one of the stables for this strong point, but has indirectly given us evidence of the commercial glory and prosperity of the age of Solomon.[92] Tell Beit Mirsim and Gezer likewise testify to expansion and strength. The building operations of Solomon in Jerusalem unfortunately cannot be traced because of the permanent sacred character of the authority now inhabiting many of these spots. But archaeology can supply the background for the type of building and its use.[93] The development of the country is also attested in the study of Solomon's sea port at Ezion Gebir on the Wady Arabah.[94] It is quite possible that the excavations by Phillips and Albright in South Arabia and Yeman will bring into historical focus the episode of The Queen of Sheba. Along with the military, political, and commercial glory there must have gone, as tradition suggests, a literary flowering. However, only one Hebrew inscription from about this period is known at present, the Gezer Calendar which is a schoolboy's exercise.

The disruption of the monarchy and the consequent invasion of Sheshonk into both Judah and Israel has both epigraphical and topographical evidence. Sheshonk's list of cities captured[95] as well as various victory stele[96] together with further destructions of the towns in the area indicated in the Bible, illustrate the manner in which tradition is confirmed by archaeology. "Archaeological evidence confirms the accounts in Kings and Chronicles: the huge Egyptian host, consisting largely of barbarian contingents from Libia and Ethiopia, carried fire and sword over the country, utterly devastating such towns as Debir and probably Bethshemesh.

91 WFA in *BP,* p. 26.

92 *BA* III, 4, pp. 41-50, IV, 1, p. 11 ff., XIII, 2, p. 28 f., and Bailey, *op. cit.,* chap. VIII. Cf. the Oriental Institute publications on Megiddo.

93 *BA,* IV, 2, p. 17 f., VII, 3, pp. 41-88, XIV, 1, p. 2. WFA in *JPP,* I, p. 46.

94 *BA,* I, 3, p. 13, II, 4, p. 37, III, 4, p. 51 ff., and Glueck's reports in *AASOR* as noted above and in Smithsonian Institute Reports.

95 Lammeyer, *Das Siegesdenkmal, des Königs Scheschonk I zu Karnak,* 1907.

96 Lamon and Shipton, *Megiddo I* (Chicago, 1939).

Once in Asia, Shishak proceeded to lay Israel as well as Judah waste."[97]

The excavations of Samaria[98] have given us a full story of the dramatic rise of Omri's dynasty. Built by Omri this city soon developed into a major capital.[99] Then, the Mesha' Stone attests to the deterioration of the dynasty. The ivories of Samaria indicate the wealth of the leader of Israel at the time of Jereboam II, against whom Amos prophesied. Perhaps we have a seal from the king at this time.[100] The increased paganization of the cult is shown by the proper names in the ostraca.[101] The commercial relations with Phoenicia are parallel to those in the days of Solomon.

The rise and fall of Assyria and Babylon, and the synchronization of these with the history of Israel and Judah has long been a topic of detailed study. Egyptian chronology was astronomically fixed about 1900.[102] The Assyrian discoveries are largely from the period 1903-1914, and the Babylonian from 1899-1914. However, the final evidence of the exact synchronization is not yet in. New evidence came to light in the Khorsabad King list,[103] which has necessitated frequent changes.[104] From this period in Judah we have a possible seal from the time of Ahaz[105] and the Herodian inscription referring to the removal of Uzziah's bones.[106] There is evidence that Uzziah also redeveloped Solomon's seaport at Ezion Gebir, Elath.[107] Of course the Siloam Inscription from Hezekiah has long been a monument of archaeological significance from this period.[108] Yet the campaign of Sennecharib against Hezekiah, attested by both Assyrian and biblical records, is not completely clarified.[109]

97 WFA in *BP*, p. 30.
98 Reisner, *op. cit.*
99 McCown, C., *op. cit.*, chap. XIII.
100 Sukenik, in *JPP*, I, p. 57.
101 WFA in *BP*, pp. 31, 38. Sukenik in *JPP*, I, p. 55 f.
102 WFA in *JPP*, I, p. 28.
103 A. Poebel in *JNES*, 1, p. 247 ff., 460 ff., and II, p. 56 ff.
104 *BASOR*, 88, p. 28; 99, p. 9.
105 Sukenik in *JPP*, I, p. 57.
106 *BASOR*, 44, p. 8 f.
107 *BA*, I, 2, p. 8 f., *BASOR* 79, p. 13 f.
108 Sukenik in *JPP*, I, p. 53 f., Pritchard, *op. cit.*
109 WFA in *BP*, p. 61, note 102.

The last days of Judah have been dramatically portrayed in the Lachish letters.[110] The political, military, and religious situation as reported by Jeremiah is amply supplemented. Perhaps one of the seals from Lachish refers to the governor Gedaliah.[111] These documents have also been of great value in the study of epigraphy and religion through the use of personal names.[112] The excavation of Lachish and of Tell Beit Mirsim illustrate the impoverished economic state of the decadent kingdom.[113] Further details on synchronism have been discovered for Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus.[114]

In the exile, life continued to have the form of a monarchy. The king continued to hold court and the aristocrats increased their possessions.[115] It is probable that the Jews in Babylon were more loyal to Yahwism than those in Palestine or in Egypt. Diaspora Judaism is illustrated by the Aramaic Papyri from Elephantine (Yeb) in Egypt.[116] It is now possible, thanks to archaeological discoveries, to reconstruct the situation of the Jews in Palestine during the Exile with general clarity. All or virtually all, of the fortified towns in Judah had been razed to the ground as thoroughly as we know to have been the case at Debir, Lachish and Bethshemesh (to mention only those sites which have been both adequately and recently excavated; the evidence is clear from many other sites from soundings and surface explorations."[117]

The decree of Cyrus to the Jews has not yet been discovered, but his tolerant attitude, and complete reversal of the drastic policies of the Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians, is now well known.

110 Torzcner, H., *Lachish I* (Oxford). Cp. Pritchard, *op. cit.*, p. 321; McCown, *op. cit.*, chap. IX; Sukenik in *JPP*, I, p. 50 f.; Gordon, *The Living Past*, chap. IX.

111 Sukenik, *JPP*, I, p. 57.

112 *BASOR*, 70, p. 11; 82, p. 18; 97, p. 22; 111, p. 24.

113 Tell Beit Mirsim III, *AASOR*, XXI-XXII, pp. 39, 65, etc.; also *PEQ*, 1937, p. 175, and 1938, p. 252.

114 Pritchard, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

115 WFA in *BP*, p. 47-48; Finegan, *op. cit.*, p. 185; Sukenik in *JPP*, I, p. 60; Bailey, *op. cit.*, chap. X; *BA*, V, 4, 49.

116 Cowley, A., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.* (Oxford, 1923), Pritchard, *op. cit.*, pp. 222, 491-492, Sukenik, *JPP*, I, p. 59 f.

117 WFA in *BP*, p. 48 gives more detail.

Therefore, "The substantial historicity of the Edict of Cyrus in 538 has been confirmed by modern archaeological discoveries."[118] The return under Zerubbabel, Nehemiah, and Ezra gradually brought about a revival of the Holy Land and an increase in the population. The date of Ezra and Nehemiah is a vexing problem still with several tentative solutions.[119] The Jewish state of the fourth century was recognized by the Persians and had semi-autonomy. This perhaps marks the beginnings of Jewish coinage.[120]

Archaeologists have not yet fathomed the mysterious rise of the synagogue. The oldest synagogue excavated is from Egypt of the third century B. C.[121] Over forty have come from Palestine. The most famous synagogue remains are from Dura Europas, Gerash, Capernaum, Beth Alpha.[122]

The Greek period is perhaps the least well understood of all in biblical history.[123] However, archaeology has discovered that Greek was known and used long before the Greek period. It shows how quickly the coastland of Philistia and Phoenicia was Hellenized. Other cities, such as Samaria and Amman, likewise indicate the extent of Greek influence. Unfortunately archaeology has often neglected this and subsequent periods, and much remains to be done.[124]

The Maccabean period is represented by the so-called tombs of Absalom and Zechariah just outside Jerusalem in the Kedron. The ruins of the Tobias fortress in Transjordan are known to be from this period but are yet to be excavated. It is possible that the recent Jericho excavations have come upon one of Bacchides' forti-

118 *Ibid.*, p. 49. Cf. Finegan, *op. cit.*, p. 192, Pritchard, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

119 WFA in *BP*, p. 64, note 133.

120 Sukenik in *JPP*, I, p. 64.

121 *Ibid.*, p. 69.

122 *Excavations of Dura Europas* (New Haven); Sukenik, E. L., *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (Oxford, 1934); Sukenik, E. L., *Present State of Synagogue Studies* (Jerusalem, 1949). Popular summary in McCown, *op. cit.*, chap. XVIII, and *BA*, VII, 1, p. 1 ff.

123 Finegan passes over this period in three pages, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-207. Cf. E. Bickerman, "Post Biblical Judaism," in *The Jews: Their History and Culture* (New York, 1949), Vol. I, p. 70 ff.

124 Reisner, *op. cit.;* also Macalister, *Gezer*, and Seller, O. R., *The Citadel of Bethzur* (Philadelphia, 1933), popularly reported by Godon in *Living Past*, p. 52 ff.

fications. The major archaeological evidence which is valuable politically, religiously, and artistically is to be gleaned from the coins. Although most of these were known before 1900 their interpretation continues apace. From the Persian period to the second captivity under Hadrian, the coins of the Jews give a clear picture of Palestinian history.[125]

The Herodian period is somewhat better known to archaeology. Josephus becomes a more reliable witness to Jewish life as he comes closer to his own times. The rebuilding of the temple by the Idumean can be seen today in the Wailing Wall and at the south-east corner of the city wall. The warning to the Gentile is to be found in the Istanbul museum.[126]

New Testament Jericho has recently been added to the cities of Jesus' times that have been excavated.[127] In addition, material remains have contributed to our knowledge at Capernaum,[128] at Gerash,[129] and again at Samaria.[130] There have been many lesser archaeological operations in and around Jerusalem from the period of the first century A. D.: The castle Antonia, "tombs of the Kings," the Third Wall, The Citadel, the Pool of Bethesda, etc.[131]

This period also brings us to the first archaeological evidence for biblical manuscripts. At times, manuscript study is not considered archaeological unless the MS. is dug up from the soil or accidentally discovered in a tomb, grave or cache, but this is a narrow point of view.[132] The Oxyrhynchus papyri of New Testa-

125 Reifenberg, A., *Ancient Jewish Coins;* Madden, F. W., *Coins of the Jews* (London, 1881, 1903); Sukenik, *JPP,* I, 64 ff.

126 Cf. Finegan plate No. 111.

127 J. Kelso in *BASOR,* 120, p. 11 ff.

128 Kohl and Watzinger, *Antike Synagogen in Galilaa,* 1916; Sukenik, E. L., *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece,* 1934.

129 C. Kraeling, *Gerasa, City of the Decapolis* (New Haven, 1938); cf. also work on Petra in *Quarterly of Department of Antiquities of Palestine,* VIII.

130 Reisner, et al., *op. cit.;* Crowfoot, Kenyon, Sukenik, *Buildings at Samaria* (Oxford, 1938).

131 For a survey cf. Finegan, *op. cit.,* p. 236 ff. Also McCown, *op. cit.,* chaps. 14, 15, 16. Cf. *BASOR,* 81, p. 6, and 83, p. 4.

132 Cf. Kenneth Clarke in *BASOR,* 122, p. 7 f.; also F. Kenyon, *The Bible and Archaeology;* Burrows, M., *op. cit.,* chap. 2.

ment interest have been known over fifty years.[133] The Nash papyri of Old Testament interest have likewise been known a long time.[134] The exciting discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has occupied the attention of archaeologists, linguists, paleographers, and others extensively.[135] It is probable that these represent on the archaeological, atomic, and paleographic evidence, text from about the first century B. C.[136] The earliest manuscript of St. Paul in any great extent is the famous Chester Beatty Papyrus.[137] Other MS. finds are surveyed adequately elsewhere.[138]

The rise and rapid spread of Christianity is evidenced in archaeology largely through excavation of churches and tombs.[139] The claim of Sukenik to have found a first century cross is still being debated.[140] The finds of lamps, pottery, frescoes, graffiti, and so on are important for the study of the religion of the period as well as the language and writing. The cities of Paul are more and more coming clear in the study of classical archaeologists. The excavations of Corinth, Antioch, Ephesus, Tarsus, and Athens[141] have much to tell us of the background of Christianity in Greece.[142]

Since the limits of biblical archaeology are reached about this time, a few sentences will complete Palestinian archaeology. The

133 Grenfel and Hunt, various books published 1897-1904.

134 S. A. Cook, 1903; cf. *JBL,* 56, p. 143.

135 Burrows, M., *Dead Sea Scrolls* (New Haven, 1950). Cf. *BASOR* and *BA* since 1947 and also *JBL,* and *Jewish Quarterly Review.*

136 Cf. *BA,* XIV, 1, p. 29 f.

137 Ed. Kenyon, 1934, 1936, 1937.

138 Cf. Finegan, *op. cit.,* pp. 307-352; Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts;* A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (New York, 1927).

139 H. C. Butler, *Princeton Expeditions to Syria* (Leyden, 1907-1922, Princeton, 1904-1905); Crowfoot, *Early Churches in Palestine* (Oxford). Finegan surveys the study of the catacombs during the past hundred years, *op. cit.,* pp. 357-392, and Sukenik surveys the Jewish ones in *JPP,* I, p. 56 f. Lowrie's *Early Christian Art* (Princeton) studies the art of the catacombs. Reifenberg, *Ancient Hebrew Art* (Jerusalem, 1950), has a brief survey also. The sarcophagi are surveyed in Finegan, *op. cit.,* pp. 393-398, and the churches, pp. 399-411. Cf. *BA,* II, 3, p. 25 f. and XII, 1, p. 1 ff. The lamps also attest to religious history. Cf. Sellers, *BA,* XII, 3, 56 f.

140 Sukenik, E. L., "The Earliest Records of Christianity," *American Journal of Archaeology,* December, 1947.

141 *Ephesus* (London, 1908); *Tarsus I* (Princeton, 1950); *Corinth* (series of American School of Classical Studies); *Antioch* (Princeton, 1950).

142 Cf. series in *BA,* III, 2, p. 18 f., IV, 1, p. 1 f., V, 3, p. 36 f., VIII, 3, p. 62, and 73 f., XI, 4, p. 1 f., XIII, 1, p. 1 f.

Byzantine period is largely represented by churches and tombs.[143] Jewish inscriptions of this Christian period from Italy have been collected.[144] By this time it has become difficult to distinguish manuscript and archaeological study. The Arab period in Palestine is recognized largely through the excavations at the Citadel in Jerusalem, at Khirbet Mafjar, at Jericho, at Acco, and at Abu Gosh, and the great fortresses throughout the Near East lead us into the Crusaders. It is to be hoped that Palestinian and Near Eastern archaeologists will be more careful in their excavation, preservation, and study of the material remains from the Greek through the Crusader periods, which may turn up the more important finds of the second half of this twentieth century.

143 Finegan, *op. cit.*, pp. 412-459.
144 Frey, J. B., *Corpus Inscriptionum judaicarum, I* (Rome, 1936).

(Continued in November issue)

Notes and Studies

LUTHER'S TEACHING ON CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY IN POLITICS AND PUBLIC LIFE

H. H. Kramm

Did Martin Luther teach the responsibility of the Christian in politics and public life, and did Martin Luther pave the way for our present-day liberties?

This question is frequently asked today. It is no theoretical question, but has its present importance for those countries in which Lutheranism is strong—in Central Europe, in Scandinavia, and in the U. S. A.

There are different answers and contradictory interpretations of Luther. The Norwegian Church, when oppressed by Nazis and Quislings, defended its freedom by protests and proclamations which constantly quoted Luther. Bishop Berggrav, the Norwegian Primate and an outstanding Lutheran scholar, often emphasized that Luther's words of four centuries ago could still be used and quoted verbatim by those who defended freedom and law—to say nothing about Christianity—against the tyrants of our day. Those German churchmen who resisted the tyranny of totalitarian states based their resistance on Luther. They refused to obey un-Christian Nazi state laws, they fought and are still fighting for the rights of the parents in school questions in Eastern Germany, and they based their protests on Martin Luther's doctrine.

On the other hand, Dean Inge has on several occasions expressed his conviction that Luther paved the way for tyranny and deification of the state and taught that princes and governments could do no wrong.

What was Luther's real opinion?

When Luther was asked to give advice to his followers on political questions—for example, when he was consulted on a new

city constitution for Erfurt, he liked to make a threefold distinction: 1. There are certain aspects of political life where Christians have definite demands to make; if these are not fulfilled the Christians are in conscience bound to resist. 2. There are other spheres of political life where Christians should give advice and utter certain wishes; but these are recommendations and constructive proposals rather than unalterable demands, and in these things Christians can yield to a certain extent. 3. There are neutral things, which are not good nor bad in themselves, but can be ordered according to the best possible human reasoning and understanding. These things Luther often leaves to three authorities: the lawyers, the princes, and reason.

Let us start with the last point (3), the "neutral" things. Of such is the question of monarchy or republic. It was not important that Luther's home state Saxony was a monarchy and the Lutheran cities of Hamburg and Lübeck were republics; monarchy must not necessarily mean tyranny or blind obedience of citizens, nor is democracy as such a guarantee for a lawful and Christian state. It was important that both monarchy and democracy be governed by men who respect law and justice and who, if possible, govern in a Christian spirit, and not in lawless tyranny.

Certain details of state constitutions, certain traditions and festivals, certain occupations or ways of trading or features of economic structure, and even many external church ceremonies and traditions (like paintings in churches and vestments of ministers) belong to this neutral sphere: they are not good or bad in themselves; it all depends on the spirit in which they are used.

It is, however, a grave mistake if Luther is interpreted as having said that *all* political things do not interest the church, that they are totally left to princes and lawyers as having been given a blank cheque to do whatever they like. He said nothing of the sort.

There are certain aspects of public life where Christians have definite demands to make (see above 1). The basic laws given by God not only to the Christians, but also to the Jews (Decalogue) must be respected; in a pagan state the Christian must be left free

to live according to his conscience. Even the pagan Roman state respected some sort of basic law (Romans 13). The Christian must be free to resist breaches of this law, e.g., fight against lies (Luther exposed lies and crimes of princes!), explain to the people the dangers of the un-Christian civilization of the East (Turks), yes, it is even the task of the Christian preacher to inform his congregation about the crimes of the Turks and the threat which their victory would bring to Christian matrimony, to Christian morals, and to the whole Christian Church. Luther distinctly demanded for the church the freedom to criticize the princes, and rebuked them for trying to suppress this freedom. Luther even described certain economic practices as so deeply anti-Christian (usury, exploitation) that he proposed excommunication for those who commit these things.

As for the church proper, Luther believed, as does the Church of England, that a Christian prince as first layman of the church may help his church in setting her house in order, but that his powers, given by the church, can be withdrawn and are strictly limited by the Word of God. When the princes interfered in the inner life of the church, Luther frequently said that the princes overstepped their power and must not be obeyed in these things. After all, the highest authorities of the German Reich, the Emperor and Reichstag, had decided against Luther and ordered him to stop his reformation activity; and Luther did not obey for a moment. How anybody who knows these facts can claim that Luther taught blind obedience to all princes and said that the state could do no wrong is scarcely understandable.

Then there are things which nowadays are often called *res mixtae,* mixed things, which are partly in the realm of the state and partly in that of the church.

In the sphere of these "mixed things" are questions of education, schools and universities, parents' rights, and marriage laws. While the state is and should be interested in these things (Luther wrote an open letter to the city magistrates impressing on them their duty in establishing schools), the church has definite demands to make. Teaching souls is a matter for the church, not for

the state. No state can abolish fundamental rights of parents, and Luther has clearly set out in his writings those demands which church and Christian parents have to make in school and university questions.

And finally there is the sphere (see above 2) in which Christians should give advice and make constructive proposals, and for which they must feel responsible to a large extent.

Luther in his books, letters, and sermons dealt with an astonishing variety of subjects; he discussed public morals, drinking and licensing hours, riots and police, beggars and welfare of the poor, foreign trade and imports, usury, banking, rents and finance, military service and foreign policies. He felt a Christian responsibility in each of these areas.

But is it not true, after all, that Luther held the state in high esteem and defended its rights?

Yes, in some ways Luther was conservative. He disliked anarchy and civil war. He thought that anarchy brings terrible suffering to poor humanity, and that even a state of doubtful value is better than no state at all; that the state is God's ordinance in this bad and sinful world in order to prevent it from falling into general chaos; that the state cannot bring about paradise on earth, but can prevent earth from becoming hell.

Therefore Luther admonished his followers to obey the governments unless these demanded something which is clearly contrary to the will of God. In that case Christians should not commit sabotage, murder tyrants, or stage revolutions, but simply refuse to obey. If a Christian is convinced that his prince is demanding military service in an unjust war, he should refuse to bear arms. The weapon of the Christian is not revolution and murder, but refusal and suffering. Luther disliked conspiracies and underground movements. The Christian should be honest, even in his resistance against state laws. When the Lutherans of a predominantly Roman Catholic city planned to establish divine service for the Lutheran minority in a private home, Luther admonished them to inform the Roman Catholic mayor and city council about it and not to proceed in secrecy.

Luther (as practically everybody at that time) feared that the existence of Protestants and Catholics side by side in the same town would lead to riots and tumults. He therefore advised his followers, where they were in a minority and not tolerated by the state, to emigrate to another country which might tolerate them, rather than to be the cause of riots.

Luther did not like the customs of several worldly rulers of calling themselves "defenders of the faith." He emphasized that convictions cannot be created or suppressed by worldly power but by "the Word of God alone." He demanded, however, freedom for those who have to preach the Word. His tolerance was admittedly limited. He did not want Roman Catholic mass to be celebrated in public, because he thought it was a blasphemy and young people would be seduced by it; he allowed it, however, in private. Certainly this tolerance was limited; but Luther was clearly more tolerant than the Pope, Calvin, Queen Elizabeth or anybody else in those times who would not have tolerated divine services of another denomination at all if they had the power to stop them.

Luther did not want to convert Roman priests or monks by force or even economic duress. He tried to organize pension funds for them and to give them time to make up their minds without pressure.

Luther, however, was afraid of those fanatical sects who tried to overthrow all state authority by conspiracy and force, to introduce compulsory re-baptism and even polygamy and threatened the very existence of the state. He thought that the state had the right to defend itself against anarchic movements, even if religious convictions were claimed for them. But would not any modern Western state act more or less on the same assumption? The fact that the two "religions" which deviated from normal were dangerous in that time, that the "sects and fanatics" tried to overthrow the state from within, the Turks from without, made Luther suspicious against the third religious variety that he knew, namely the Jews. There he imagined dangers which, in this form, certainly did not exist, and he often used violent language, though at times he also showed a more friendly attitude towards the Jews,

especially in his young years and in his last years. But this, for him, was a purely religious question; it had nothing whatever to do with present-day racial anti-semitism, which is clearly of pagan origin. And the attitude of the non-Lutheran Churches towards the Jews at that time was in no way superior to that of Luther.

While Luther recognized that the peasants and farmers of his time had a good case in demanding social reforms and participation at pastoral elections, he always resisted the tendency to degrade the Gospel into a handbook of social politics—no social structure or church constitution as such is absolutely Christian and prescribed by the Bible—and always warned against using brute force and crime. He resisted the peasants when they used war and crime, burned whole cities, and tortured innocent citizens to death and threatened the whole of Germany with anarchy. He then thought it to be the duty of the states and princes to restore law and order by every means possible.

In church affairs Luther resisted from his early days the application of force: "to burn Heretics is against the will of the Holy Spirit" (except in the case of criminals and anarchists whom the state may persecute under state law). People who hold wrong doctrine and lead an un-Christian life may be excommunicated from the church, but this excommunication should not carry with it any civil disadvantage. Even such people are allowed to hear the sermon so that they may be converted by "the Word," but they should not be admitted to the Lord's table.

It cannot be denied that Luther in many respects paved the way for our present-day liberties, and that in questions of tolerance and freedom, while still a child of his age, he was much more advanced than any other religious reformer of his time or the Pope.

REFORMATION RESEARCH

HAROLD J. GRIMM

The desire of a number of Lutheran educators to stimulate research in the field of the Reformation in this country and help

German scholars of the period resume their activities led to the formation of the American Society of Reformation Research. This society was formed by those historians who met at Valparaiso University August 29-30, 1946, at the invitation of Dr. Ernest G. Schwiebert, who was then professor of history at that institution.

During its first two years the society met annually in joint sessions with the American Historical Association and the American Society of Church History, arranged for the presentation of scholarly papers, and discussed ways and means for encouraging original research and translations of significant documents. It also decided to extend membership to all persons interested in the Reformation, regardless of religious affiliations.

At its annual meeting in Boston, Massachusetts, December 30, 1949, the society decided to cooperate with the German Verein fuer Reformationsgeschichte in reviving the *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte* as an international journal. The first two issues of volume 42 (1951) were published by Bertelsmann of Gütersloh, Germany, last month. The articles will normally be in German and English, but with occasional contributions from Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, France, and Italy. In any case, summaries in English will accompany non-English articles.

The editors for Germany are Gerhard Ritter of the University of Freiburg i Br. and Heinrich Bornkamm of the University of Heidelberg; for the United States, Harold J. Grimm of The Ohio State University and Roland H. Bainton of the Yale Divinity School. The board will later be enlarged to include editors from other countries. The publication will be semi-annual, each volume consisting of 288 pages. The price is $4.00 to members of the American Society for Reformation Research and $5.00 for non-members. It is hoped that the journal will enlist the cooperation of historians of many lands and confessions, thereby engendering mutual understanding and respect. Readers of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY are invited to support this important venture by subscribing to the *Archiv* and submitting articles for publication.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

I Believe in the Holy Spirit. By Fredrik Wisloff. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1949. 272 pages. $3.00.

The bulk of religious research, study, and writing goes on with little apparent interest in the soul's salvation. These efforts concern themselves with the origins of Christianity, the explanation of its mysteries, and the psychological and sociological value of the meaning and ministries of religion. There is much questing for redemption but little arriving. This book, however, deals with arrival. It discloses with unembarrassed intimacy what the converted man believes, knows, does, and feels when he has been called, gathered, and enlightened as a member of the church by the Holy Spirit through the Gospel. To this reviewer it is not so much a book about the Holy Spirit as it is a book by the Holy Spirit through the pen of a writer in the more widely known mood of Ole Hallesby.

To appreciate this work the reader should be acquainted with the Inner Mission school of thought which has run through the Lutheran churches of Scandinavia like a current of fresh, shining water slithering through the tarnished, backed-up waters of the ocean. Professor George Aus has written a brief but informative story of the Inner Mission movement in the Foreword. While some of us stand around awaiting fire from heaven to inflame the wood gathered on the altar, it is hope-inspiring to learn that the fire in this case descended during the giving of a series of Bible studies by a member of the theological faculty of the University at a time, about a century ago, when no one particularly expected the University to be the source of new life for God's people. "The spirit that pervaded the meetings was so penetrating and so arresting that men and women were gripped by the Spirit of God and led to a personal experience of salvation. The impact of the awakening soon began to be felt in other places, with the result that what started out as an unpretentious series of devotional Bible studies grew till it became a movement which spread to the far corners of the land."

Fredrik Wisloff, the author, developed as a Christian and a theologian under the influence of men like Hallesby and Moe. After spending several years in America, he returned to Norway to be a teacher and subsequently the president of the Inner Mission Society. Since 1946 he has divided his time between preaching and writing. The book here reviewed was written in 1936 and published simultaneously in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. He has also written "With Him Every Day," "With Him in Golgotha," "Heaven," and other books. He has traveled extensively on foreign mission fields. Some of his work has been translated into Chinese.

The treatment does not pretend to be scientific or precisely scholarly. The author deals with the doctrinal material of the third article of the Apostles' Creed as it exists in the life of the believer—especially as it is discovered in the heart of the pietistic believer, let the reader be apprised. Here one finds the practice of piety as one finds the practice of the presence of God in Brother Lawrence. There are eight intense chapters: (1) The Spirit and the Trinity, (2) The Spirit and the Word, (3) The Spirit and the World, (4) The Spirit and the Church, (5) The

1 Books received or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

Spirit and the Christian, (6) The Blasphemy Against the Spirit, (7) Sanctification, and (8) Filled With the Spirit. The skeleton bones have been removed. It is all meat devotionally seasoned. The book will induce the right kind of heart-burn, if you read with a loving heart and if you check, but not necessarily renounce, the critical apparatus of your mind. And why not do just that, even cautiously, when what we cry for is the Living God and not Logical Glue!

Here is a mine of fertile quotations from both well known and obscure classics of devotional and pietistic literature. The author's homely illustrations coruscate without ever striving for literary brilliance. The book is excellent preparation for teaching the Catechism. It is a practical approach to counseling people who believe that Jesus Christ and not Freud died to make them free. It offers many sermon helps and insights. It may even be the bellows to fan ideological Christianity to warmer praise of the Holy Spirit's place in the life of the believer.

The translation has been done faithfully, Professor Aus assures us, by Ingvald Daehlin.

OSCAR W. CARLSON

The Belief in Progress. By John Baillie. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1951. 240 pages. $2.75.

For more than a century the idea of progress has dominated Western thought. It has become so prevalent as to give the impression of being a part of our native equipment.

In his *The Belief in Progress* Professor Baillie proposes to investigate the foundations on which so widespread a confidence rests.

The main line of the investigation is historical. The author traces the history of the idea of progress from early Greece down to the present scene. As a result of his investigations, Professor Baillie concludes that empirically man may be said to have made progress in two areas—in his ability to control his physical environment and in his ability to adjust himself to an increasingly complex social environment. Beyond this, he does not believe there is any empirical evidence for belief in progress.

If belief in progress cannot be demonstrated empirically, it must rest on a priori foundations. Professor Baillie next proceeds to ask which these are and to evaluate them. In post-Renaissance thought he finds three a priori positions which have been offered in support of the idea of progress: (1) that of the French Renaissance which held that moral and social improvement would inevitably follow on any increase of knowledge about man and his environment; (2) that of German idealism which held that history illustrates that development is of the very nature of things and consequently that development is to be regarded as a metaphysical principle descriptive of the ultimate nature of reality; (3) that of nineteenth century science which held that all of history could be viewed as a single stream, governed by a single general law—the law of evolution. In its philosophical form, this third point of view came to posit that reality itself is in process of realization.

Professor Baillie then essays to demonstrate why each of these grounds fails to do justice to the demands of the human situation and raises the question whether "original Christianity" (which he considers to be the real source of a teleological conception of history) can supply the a priori foundation necessary to save belief in progress. With its twofold emphasis on a decisive victory already accomplished and a future day of fulfilment when the implications of this victory will be fully realized, Christianity offers a basic framework within which belief in progress may find foundation. In the facts that the initial victory has already been won and that the ultimate victory is assured, a basis for belief in progress has been laid. As the

church carries out its mission, real progress is made toward the ultimate victory.

This book is a masterpiece of analysis. The skill with which Professor Baillie traces, analyzes, and evaluates the idea of progress in its historical appearances is unusual. For those who seek orientation in the philosophies that have undergirded modern man's faith in progress, this little book will prove very welcome. While some may feel that he has not done full justice to the New Testament view of the end of time, nevertheless all will agree that the author has rendered Christian theology a signal service in this product of his thought and pen.

GEORGE AUS

Positive Protestantism, An Interpretation of the Gospel. By Hugh Thompson Kerr, Jr. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950. 147 pages. $2.50.

In the world of business the broker stands between the producer and the retailer performing an important function; he is the gatherer, organizer, and distributor of the product.

In Christian literature there is a similar function that is descriptive of a whole area of books. Each generation of preachers needs such a mediatorial work to make available for better preaching the discoveries, new insights, interpretations, established results of biblical and theological scholarship.

It is in this area that the Presbyterian Church is presently doing so fine a job. In the Quarterly, *Theology Today,* and by means of a steady output of studies aimed at the clergy and the more literate laity, the vigorous modern studies concerned with the primitive Gospel, the age of the Reformation, the relevancy of classical Christian faith for modern life are being mediated with unusual clarity and succinctness.

Behind Professor Kerr's book stands a long line of excellent modern studies. Distilled from them are four assertions, a discussion of which constitutes the substance of this little book: (a) Protestantism carries within itself a negative burden in virtue of the fact that it tends to limit its charter to the historical situation that marked its emergence, and hence is tempted to relate itself to contemporary existence in an anachronistic and un-immediate way. (b) A "deeper plunge into the Gospel . . ." alone will reveal and release the content of the Protestant "protest," transform the protest into a positive, unbound declaration of grace relevant to all times and to all men everywhere. (c) This Gospel, very precisely, "is the good news of God in Christ for man's redemption. This is the core and essence of the Christian faith. . . . It is the source of all true theology, the impulse of Christian ethics, the theme of preaching, the charter of evangelism, the bond of fellowship. . . . It is the gospel that judges us and not we the gospel. . . . It was the gospel that the Reformers rediscovered in the sixteenth century, and it is the gospel that Protestantism today must recapture if it is to stand upon its feet and proclaim the living Word of God." (d) The "new preaching of the Gospel" must somehow manage to address the perplexities and confusions of contemporary existence in language which is fashioned out of a knowledge of actual men's lives and shaped to declare salvation meaningfully to present perdition.

This is a good book for the pastor, not only for its sound self alone, but the incitement it offers to the pastor—who is too frequently operating with an unenlarged stock of preaching sources—to avail himself of the biblical and theological studies which stand almost palpably behind this condensed statement. Dodd and Manson in the biblical field, and Watson, Carlson, and Kantonen in the theological and historical, are men whose work fills in the dimensions here so briefly indicated.

JOSEPH SITTLER

Ämbetet i den Svenska Kyrkan. By Ragnar Askmark. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1949. 483 pages. Kr. 12:50.

The author of this volume has for several years served as *docent* at the University of Lund and here presents some of the results of his research with respect to the meaning of the ministry in the Church of Sweden. He has, as the subtitle of the book also indicates, limited his studies to the era of the Reformation and the periods of Orthodoxy and Pietism.

The book is divided into five sections, dealing with the following subjects: "The Word and the Ministry," "The Church and the Ministry," "Grades and Distinctions within the Ministry," "The Apostolic Succession and the Church of Sweden," and "The Call to the Ministry and Ordination." In each of these areas Dr. Askmark first presents the teachings of the Reformers and then shows how these teachings were received by the theologians in Sweden and how new emphases were introduced by both Orthodoxy and Pietism. For Luther it was clear that the ministry was dependent on the Word and derived its power and authority only in so far as it proclaimed the Word. The Swedish reformer, Olaus Petri, held the same concept with reference to the meaning and importance of the ministry and maintained that in the proclamation of the Word the chief characteristic of the ministry is to be found. In the later development the idea of the power of the keys was given a prominent place in connection with the ministry, and it was held that this power belonged to the ministry (to the *Amt*) rather than to the Gospel. The power of the keys also came to include the authority to inflict corporal punishment on offenders. This was made possible, so the author affirms, by reason of the fact that the church and its theologians had departed from the principle that the authority of the church and that of the state should not be mixed and that in using the power of the keys the Word and not external force should be employed. Moreover—and most important of all—there had also been a departure from the principle that absolution should be given on the basis of repentance only and without the imposition of any temporal "satisfactions." All of this had its attendant dangers in that it became difficult, if not impossible, at a given occasion to judge whether the minister acted on the basis of the commandments of God or followed the laws and dictates of the state.

Due to the intermingling of church and state the question soon arose as to whether the office of the ministry could be rightly administered by a person who was not "spiritual," i.e., was not a true Christian. The author claims that the period of Orthodoxy inadvertently prepared the way for this discussion even though theoretically it held that the kingdom of God could be furthered also by a minister who was not himself "regenerated." This was, of course, denied by Pietism, and one of its adherents, Erik Tolstadius, made the statement (about the year 1730) that the unconverted minister is an enemy of Christ; he is "a servant of condemnation, belongs to the kingdom of the devil, and carries souls away from God rather than unto Him." Orthodoxy strove to unite all men under the influence and power of the Gospel, and Pietism, on the other hand, sought to separate and divide. The former stressed the concepts of reconciliation and justification, and the latter placed its emphasis on regeneration and sanctification. According to Pietism the most important aspect of the work of the minister was that he understand and explain the meaning of Scripture. Now, this could not be done apart from the illumination that was wrought by the Spirit, and this, again, was not given to any other than those who were regenerated. With respect to the sacraments, the Pietists also were of the opinion that their efficacy was invalidated if they were administered by a person who did not have a living faith or who did not have the

right call to the ministry and who did not have the right "intention." Consequently a mingling of evangelical concepts and the Catholic idea of the necessity of "right intentions" had taken place.

The Church of Sweden claims, and rightly so, that it stands in the apostolic succession and proves this by pointing to the fact that at the time of the Reformation in Sweden bishops were consecrated for the Evangelical Church by men who stood in the apostolic succession. This, however, did not preclude a discussion as to the real meaning of this "succession." Orthodoxy, following the Catholic tradition, seemed prone to stress that the ministry is a divine institution and that those who hold that office are, in a direct line, the followers of the apostles. This succession, then, is also the foundation for the authority of the minister and should furnish him with the courage and fearlessness necessary in his calling. Other views with respect to the ministry were also in evidence. Thus the "Church Order" of 1571 maintains that there was no distinction between prophet, priest, and messenger in the Old Testament, nor, on the other hand, between these and Christ, the apostles, and the preachers in the New Testament. Thus it is the ministry as such that stands in the "succession," and this does not ultimately depend on the *potestas ordinis* of the bishop but on the activity of God who calls men into the sacred office. In the case of necessity God can call men directly to become His ministers, and these then have the same office as those who have received a "regular" ordination.

This is in all respects a "meaty" volume and contains a wealth of information on the subject discussed. Almost every page gives evidence of the author's knowledge of the surprisingly large number of original sources from which he has drawn his material. He pictures well the theological situation in Sweden with reference to office of the ministry during the periods under consideration, but there is also a great deal of information of a more general character, and the book is well worth a study by any one who is interested in the nature and significance of the ministry.

C. G. Carlfelt

The Church and Contemporary Change. By G. Bromley Oxnam. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. 132 pages. $2.50.

The five chapters of this little volume are based on a series of lectures delivered by the author at the Pacific School of Religion and the Chicago Theological Seminary. In Chapter One he discusses "The Nature of the Contemporary Crisis." We are living in an era of change or transition. Change is brought about by the advancement of research and technology and motivated by the aspirations of the human spirit for the more abundant life. It becomes the duty of thoughtful men to direct the process of transition in such a way that the tension between power and justice may be solved and the worth of the human personality safeguarded. Here the author proceeds to an extended discussion of the difference between Communism and Christianity. He finds this to be basically the difference between atheism and theism, and resulting from it the difference in the evaluation of the human personality. The ultimate solution of the conflict between the two, therefore, will come only when "a revival of religion, in which the regenerating power of God's love and forgiveness, righteousness and justice, is let loose in the world, by which the individual heart is changed and our political, social and economic life becomes Christian in spirit and practice" (p. 29).

The subject of Chapter Two is: "The Minister in a New Environment." The minister confronted with a changing environment must do more than simply wait for what is coming to pass. "If a minister prays, 'Thy Kingdom come,' and placidly sits in the fig-tree shade to await its com-

ing, he is likely to find himself alone because men will have marched past him, carrying banners that proclaim, 'Faith without works is dead'" (p. 33). If the tensions are to be dissolved peaceably, by democratic process, the minister must recognize the social and economic forces already at work. The old capitalistic individualism is passing away, the welfare state is approaching. The minister must lead the procession, thinks Oxnam. But in so doing he must be loyal to the fundamental principles of the faith. "He must call for the rebasing and the remotivating of society in terms of the ethical principles that lie at the heart of his faith, but he must never forget that in an hour of changing environment the central message of Christianity is one of salvation. . . . All social change in which the minister labors has as its final objective the salvation of the human soul, the reconciliation of man with man, and man with God" (p. 40).

"Religious Liberty and the Changing World" is the subject of the third chapter. After discussing the concept of religious liberty as defined by the Federal Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, Oxnam proceeds to compare it with the well known Roman Catholic concept, quoting extensively from authoritative Roman Catholic writings and illustrating the application of the Roman Catholic principle by examples from Spain, Peru, Mexico, and Bolivia. He then takes up the principle of separation of church and state and the need of a new emphasis on that principle. Next he comes to the discussion of the Roman Catholic demand for support of parochial schools from public funds, arguing convincingly against such support. Finally, he raises the question of a United States ambassador at the Vatican. He is against it.

In Chapter Four the author comes to a subject that is obviously close to his heart: "The Social Service State and Serfdom." He maintains that a social service state, or "welfare state," is the best form of economic organization and that it can be intelligently and successfully "planned" by men of sound Christian principles to remove the "serfdom" of the exploited and underprivileged masses. He fully recognizes, however, that the deepest source of class conflict and economic strife is "the sinfulness and greed of the human heart." Hence the primary task of the church remains the conversion of the individual. The regenerative force of the Gospel, as it changes the heart of the individual, will thus "transform economic relationship into a fellowship and the individual into a brother" (p. 84). One wonders, as one reads this chapter, what the church is to do when industrial managers and leaders of labor unions refuse to be thus "transformed." Does the church now attempt to impose Christian principles of fellowship and brotherhood upon them despite that fact? Does it seek to promote legislation in line with these principles and demand their enforcement? Does the Gospel now become Law? Apparently the author does not favor this. Quoting from the report of the National Study Conference on the Church and Economic Life held in Detroit in February, 1950, in the formulation of which he had a prominent part, he says, "Christians and church groups seeking to *educate* [my italics] people to take responsible economic action should understand these areas of our economy [e.g., a properly regulated price system, governmental taxes and expenditures, etc.] and clarify for themselves the action they believe ought to be taken to best serve such values as freedom and justice in those areas" (p. 104). If this means that the church *as the church* must not go into politics to achieve what it considers to be worthy economic and social ends, but must continually bear witness to the Christian principles pertaining to these issues and so train those who are willing to listen to its teachings in the proper exercise of their citizenship in these areas, we agree.

In the final chapter of this interesting little book, the author proposes a "Chris-

tian Strategy in the Light of the World Crisis." Strategy presupposes a task, a mission to be accomplished. The mission of the church today was stated thus by the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948: "The evident demand of God in this situation is that the whole church should set itself to the total task of winning the whole world for Christ." To achieve this objective, an overall Christian strategy must be planned. Oxnam suggests the following points: "(1) The divisions of the church must be healed; (2) it must regain its touch with the dominant realities of today; (3) it must speak effectively upon the subject of war, as well as build constructively in the interest of peace; (4) it must realize that God is actively at work in history, and summon Christians to take courage and to become co-workers with the Eternal; it must make it abundantly clear to all men everywhere that its interest is not in property, nor in power, nor in prestige. It refuses to summon men to a holy war. Its missionary enterprise is not for the purpose of furthering the foreign policies of states, nor the imperialistic designs, if such there be, of the powers of the west; its purpose is to teach the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (pp. 107-132).

An outstanding feature of the book is the extensive quotations, which constitute about one-third of the text. They are from the writings of historians and poets, Catholic and Protestant churchmen, reports of study groups and special conferences, pronouncements of the Federal Council and the World Council of Churches, etc. Perhaps nowhere else will the reader find such a collection of pertinent material between the covers of one book. Unfortunately there is no index to facilitate finding what you want.

The rambling style and the occasional lack of coherence and sequence detract from the enjoyment of reading the book.

P. H. Buehring

Living as Comrades. By Daniel Johnson Fleming. New York: Agricultural Missions, Inc., 1950. 180 pages. $1.50.

Says the blurb on the jacket, "Here is a study of ways of deepening a sense of community upon which better human relations so much depend." Precisely—and a most excellent study! The author, himself once a missionary and then for three decades professor of missions at Union Theological Seminary, New York, is thoroughly aware that the heart of the Christian gospel lies in the area of community, togetherness, genuine fellowship, and that these are in the present world-situation the crying needs of mankind and of men.

He analyzes these needs and, through personal experience, a wide acquaintance with missions at home and abroad, and a wide correspondence with numerous missionaries in all parts of the world, discovers the factors which contribute to community and those which interfere with its achievement. Almost every element and aspect of living together — housing, furnishings, food, health, education, play, spirit, attitudes, sharing, and many others—are carefully studied, with perceptivity and sensitivity. His points are profusely illustrated by apposite quotations from numerous missionaries in many parts of the world. The whole makes delightful and profitable reading, stimulates profound and self-searching thought, and tends to awaken and deepen in the responsive reader a spirit of repentance, of consecration, of sacrifice, of mutuality.

While the materials of the book are drawn largely from missionary experiences and the life in mission fields—thus making a volume of special interest to persons connected with the missionary enterprise or preparing themselves for it—any Christian, or for that matter any person of good will, will find the suggestions offered speaking quite pointedly and provokingly to him and the situation in which

he lives and moves and has his being. A good book, deserving a very wide reading!

PAUL J. HOH

Responsible Christianity. By Justin Wroe Nixon. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. 190 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Nixon's purpose is to penetrate into the heart of the Christian message and to state it in terms of the needs and the thought-patterns of life today. The result is a concise and meaty book which gives the Christian answer to some of the most important questions being asked at present by educated and thinking people. The emphasis is "not on detailed philosophical answers to the objections to Christianity but on the faith and life out of which effective answers can come."

The first chapter contains a discriminating analysis of the spiritual atmosphere of our day. The most significant change is the passing of nineteenth century idealism and the emergence of a naturalism patterned on the scientific outlook. But the religious thinkers who have sought to fit spiritual values into the framework of the new thought have failed to satisfy the need of the human spirit for a meaningful existence. Following a Whitehead or a Dewey they have conceived of God as a creative process within the natural universe or a union of ideals and natural forces but have succeeded only in offering "a God without a mind saving men without souls by the techniques of psychic and social adjustment." In the realm of ethics, as the Kinsey Report shows, the naturalistic approach tends to assume that what is "natural" for animals is "normal" for men. Without a genuine spiritual order both right reverence and human dignity are lost.

To Dr. Nixon the scientific and the religious views on man's nature are ultimately compatible. Man must be acknowledged to be an amphibian, animal and spirit, motivated by both a materialistic push and a spiritual pull. But religion is concerned with "the eternal dimension," the awareness of spiritual depth in existence. The substance of religion is holiness, a holy God, a holy way of life, a holy community, and the hope of a holy destiny. And the fruits of religion are reverence, discipline, peace of mind, and freedom. In a word, religion makes for *responsible* living in accordance with realities beyond man that have a claim upon him.

Against this background the author presents "the basic Christian insight," Christ as the revelation of God. "The 'good news' of Christianity was that *the God,* the ultimate reality of the world, had become accessible to men in Christ." Christ, the Pioneer of Life, *was* man but *meant* God. Through him we obtain an insight into God's love as the ultimate force in history, a true appreciation of human nature, and the divine directive for man's life in history. The revelation centers in the Cross, the meeting-point of the vertical dimension of redemptive power from a transtemporal realm and the horizontal dimension, the creation of a brotherhood across all cleavages. Jesus does not eliminate from human life every motive other than self-giving love but he does bring about a transfiguration of human motives by a higher loyalty. This transfiguration can be such a profound deliverance from self-interest and group-interest that a man becomes "a new creature in Christ." The validity of this life-transforming truth is attested not by rational demonstration but by the commitment of faith.

In his final chapter the author presents the vision of "a new apostolic age." The primary task of Christianity today is to create an adequate system of meaning and value by bringing, first of all, a new vital sense of God. Not theoretical atheism but practical idolatry is the ultimate spiritual peril. The motivation for the task is furnished by love which helps men to enter into their full heritage as children of God, believes in the creative possibilities of human beings,

practices the co-operative method of living, and is constantly concerned with the needs of the under-privileged. The agency for the enterprise is a Church characterized by both integrity and adaptability, a Church which is not a "cystlike structure living by the social body" but by its example as well as its teaching acting as a regenerative force. Responsible Christianity calls for a Church awake to the need "for a more adequate teaching of the Christian faith; a more earnest effort to exemplify it by co-operating for larger objectives; a more venturesome endeavor to project Christianity into society; and more thoughtfulness in interpreting Christ to the world."

Dr. Nixon has written a good book and earned the gratitude of all who seek to make living Christianity intelligible to present-day seekers after truth. He writes with clarity and conviction and from a background of extensive reading and mature thinking. He knows how to put the Christian message into contemporary language without compromising its content. If there is any adverse criticism, it lies in the fact that his thought tends to cast Christianity into a moralistic mold and thus to disregard the eschatological outlook which is its most distinctive characteristic. But in the perspective of this world and this moment his book shows a commendable sense of what is basic and vital in Christianity.

T. A. KANTONEN

Basic Issues in Christian Thought. By Albert C. Knudson. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950. 220 pages. $2.75.

When I was half-way through this book, I happened to see a newspaper review of a book by a layman in the Roman Church, who declared that F. D. Roosevelt was the Anti-Christ and made other deductions of a similarly scientific character from Bible passages. It pointed up rather vividly the plea Dr. Knudson makes for the use of reason in theology. The only defense against such aberrations is a rational exegesis—which includes not only a sane interpretation of individual passages but also a total world-view that is reasonable. We have been too prone to let "rationalism" become a bogey word; we need to become more adult in our attitude to the place of reason in religion. Dr. Knudson takes up the cudgels valiantly and rather effectively against the blatant recrudescence of irrationalism in "neo-orthodoxy" as well as against other violations of rationality.

Nevertheless, he is far from saying the final word on the relationship between faith and reason. He overexalts reason. And this is no mere accident. It is a consistent part of his total view. He rejects the idea of innate depravity as irrational. Consequently he does not accept the view that human reason actually is perverted, although of course he admits that it is limited. And therefore he constantly brings doctrines under the test of human reason, and freely rejects those that do not meet the test.

Dr. Knudson has been a life-long proponent of the philosophy of personalism, following in the footsteps of Borden P. Bowne. He has rendered valuable service in this respect. His exposition of personality, both human and divine, in this book is brief but worthwhile. He shows how traditional Christian theology has not always held consistently to this fundamental. More especially he shows the dangers from contemporary attitudes and tendencies that are opposed to it, and exposes the fallacies in these modern threats against this truth which is so essential not only to Christianity but also to all worthwhile living.

The analysis of personality leads to a strong emphasis on human freedom; whether one is ready to go the whole way with Dr. Knudson in this or not, his arguments deserve careful study. When he comes to treat of the Trinity, however, his over-rationalism leads him to modalism. Certainly the traditional terminology of "three Persons" has commonly de-

generated into a practical tri-theism and needs restudy and probably reformulation; but the constructive answer to this need is not to be found here.

The discussion of sin is hampered by a definition which limits sin to voluntary departure from the right. This automatically excludes the idea of original sin. The criticism of some aspects of the traditional doctrine is incisive, but the author fails to do justice to the whole situation existing in human life and character. In this connection he makes a valid distinction between the language of devotion and that of theology; but it seems to me that the devotional confession of utter sinfulness actually expresses more of a reality than he is willing to admit.

Perhaps the most baffling problem in theology is concerned with the Person of Christ. The discussion here is stimulating but not satisfying. It is centered on the phrase in II Corinthians 5:19, "God was in Christ." First of all, there is a real doubt as to the translation of this; it is at least equally possible that here, as often, the Greek preposition has the significance "in the power of, by means of," rather than the local meaning; so that Paul's statement is, "God, by the agency of Christ, was reconciling the world." But even if the traditional translation is accepted, this statement is not sufficiently comprehensive for a Christology; Philippians 2:55 ff. and John 1:1, at least, need to be used. The pre-existence of Christ is reduced to a figurative and symbolic expression, and the reality of Jesus as God-man seems to me to be lost.

The redemptive work of Christ is discussed all too briefly. Here again there are keen criticisms of some of the crudities of theory in older theologies—criticisms which cannot be lightly dismissed and ought to be carefully pondered. The fact of God's initiative is stressed, and the revelation of God's love. But one looks in vain for an adequate recognition and formulation of the profound truths contained in this supreme act of God.

Synergism is frankly adopted and defended. But in spite of this there are helpful insights and analyses in his chapter on "Divine and Human Factors in Christian Experience."

In discussing Christian ethics, Dr. Knudson seeks to maintain both an essential continuity with natural ethics and a real uniqueness. A major point of interest in this chapter is the attack on Nygren's conception of Christian love (*Agape and Eros*). There is also a stirring picture of the social aspect of Christian ethics, both in general and in relation to Communism in particular.

There are so many topics discussed and so many rival theories surveyed in this book that inevitably some of it is rather superficially done. At many places one could wish for a more thorough exposition and justification of the positions taken. But of course there is a real place for such a brief compendium. One other disappointing aspect is the small consideration given to Lutheran teachings; Calvinism, neo-orthodoxy, humanism, etc., are discussed, but distinctive Lutheran teachings are largely ignored.

HAROLD L. CREAGER

So We Believe, So We Pray. By George A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 256 pages. $2.75.

The content of this book is divided into two parts. The first part is a positive assertion of the main tenets of the Christian faith with chapters on faith in God, in Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit, in the church, in forgiveness, and in life eternal. The second part is an analysis and application of the Lord's Prayer, devoting a chapter to each of the petitions. It might be said that the first section discusses the Christian faith and the second the Christian life, but in neither section is there an artificial separation of the two.

The book is easily read, mainly because it is very well written. At times there is even a temptation to forget the content in genuine enjoyment of form.

Drawing from a wide reading and practical knowledge, the author fills the discussion with a great variety of illustrations, applications, and suggestions, which bring out his point of view in a stimulating fashion. Especiallly the section on the Lord's Prayer offers challenge and stimulation. We are given real teaching and real preaching with inspiration for other teaching and preaching. Concerning the statement of the faith it must be said that the author makes a strong attempt at presenting the historic beliefs of the church in a positive and preserving fashion as over against the negativisms of a past generation.

The study as a whole is a fine contribution to Christian literature, yet it leaves one with an unwanted frustration. The very brilliancy of the style overpowers the reader and it is not until he has caught his breath (if he ever does) that he discovers that some of the answers are rhetorical rather than logical. Rhetoric has its place and poetic preaching wins one's admiration, but there is a limit to suggestion. Eloquence carries a real threat to itself.

The author makes a valiant attempt to state the historic beliefs of the church in a fresh and modern way while keeping the core of the faith. In many ways he succeeds admirably, yet this reader must again confess frustration in the testimony, especially in regard to Christology. It is not negative; merely not positive enough. Objection to it raises a problem, however. It is not sufficient to point out that it does not conform to an historic formulation of doctrine. Buttrick's presentation is too dynamic to be refuted by any static statement. Nor can scripture quotation invalidate it. He too is faithful to the Bible, and any argument hurled against him would therefore be interpretation hurled against interpretation.

We are faced with the problem, here as in so many other ways, of the criterion by which we can judge doctrine. Such a criterion must shun the extreme of subjective fluidity as well as the extreme of objective petrification. Yet it must be both objective and personal. The historic faith, confessed by the church, must be living and vital in a modern world. Buttrick seeks this aim with partial success, and we are grateful to him for the edification and challenge of his attempt.

J. Knudsen

Debatt Med Profan-Humanismen. By Torsten Bohlin. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1951. 158 pages. Kr. 6:50.

Bishop Bohlin completed the manuscript of this book before his death and sent it to the publisher but did not get the opportunity to read the proofs or see it through the press. Gunnar Hirdman had published a volume with the title *Humanism och kristendom* (Humanism and Christianity) in which he had criticized some of Bishop Bohlin's earlier works with respect to their attitude to all forms of secular humanism. This volume is Bohlin's answer to Hirdman. Bohlin was interested in the ethical values which humanism emphasizes and manifested a social interest which was much greater than that of most Swedish theologians. The main thesis of the book is that ethical values must find their basis in religion and the religious attitude to life. Secular humanism has no satisfactory basis for its values. We cannot take the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount as a basis for conduct without also taking seriously the God-consciousness of the author of that sermon. Jesus cannot be the ideal man unless we also take seriously the vertical dimensions of his life. We cannot separate the ethic of Jesus from his religion. The brotherhood of man will become meaningless unless we have a common Father in God. Hirdman apparently thinks that the ancient Greeks and Romans established ethical systems without a religious basis, but Bohlin points out that there was a religious attitude behind their ethical consciousness. Secular humanism is

not sufficiently realistic about the tensions of human nature when it sets up man as his own standard for ethical values.

In addition to its main thesis the book deals incidentally with many other theological problems, such as the relation between faith and dogma, the doctrine of hell, the virgin birth, the resurrection of Christ, the atonement, and the ethical attitudes of the church.

It is interesting to see a Swedish churchman coming to grips with the problems of the day in a manner such as Bishop Bohlin has in this volume, but the volume also is a testimony to the fact that Lutheran unity on a doctrinal basis is a matter of a rather distant future.

A. D. MATTSON

Ekumeniska Preludier. By Nils Karlström. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1949. 117 pages. Kr. 5.

In 1947 Nils Karlström published his *Kristna Samförståndssträvanden Under Världskriget 1914-1918,* which deserves far wider notice than it has received in this country. Chapter I, consisting of 137 pages, is probably still the best general survey we have, in any language, of the growth of the ecumenical idea in the nineteenth century. This chapter should be translated into English for the orientation it would give American readers who still think the ecumenical idea sprang full-fashioned out of our own day. Karlström was intimately associated with Nathan Söderblom, and his work (a doctor's dissertation) considers the movements toward unity in the churches from the viewpoint of Uppsala, but the comprehensive nature of the work and the thorough documentation makes it a source book of inestimable value for all students of the ecumenical movement.

Chapter II of the 1947 volume was a study of Söderblom up to the time of his becoming archbishop of Upsala, in 1911. It bore the title, "The Development of Nathan Söderblom into an Ecumenical Leader." The book under review is a reprint of this chapter as an independent treatise. Here the reader will find a carefully documented study of Söderblom as student, as professor at Uppsala and Leipzig, as pastor in Paris, and here it will become clear that wide and varied contacts, stretching from Northfield, Massachusetts, to Constantinople, entered into the making of Söderblom's ecumenical mind. His was no one-track mentality fanatic about the union of churches at any price. On the contrary, a rich personality and a glowing spirit transmuted elements of simple piety, concern for the laboring classes, hatred of war, obedience to scriptural truth, knowledge of non-Christian religions, and a sense of divine vocation into a burning zeal for the welfare of the church of Christ and a whole-hearted committal to its Lord. This chapter, too, is worthy of translation for the benefit of leaders who cannot read this stirring story in the original Swedish.

CONRAD BERGENDOFF

The Legacy of Maimonides. By Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. 128 pages. $3.75.

"Naturalism is a hypothesis. It is an exaggeration of the method competent in the inquiries of science into a philosophy of the universe. Reason is precious but it is insufficient in itself to guide life. There is another source of truth, revelation, out of which has come the decisive word about God and the universe, and about the meaning of the drama of human existence on earth." With these ringing words Rabbi Bokser summarizes the lessons which modern man can learn from the greatest Jewish theologian and philosopher of the Middle Ages. To us, Maimonides' philosophical significance rests primarily on the fact that he opened the parade of the theologians who attempted to make religion acceptable to human reason with the help of Aristotle. He influenced not only Jewish thinkers, and particularly Spinoza, but he also had considerable influence

upon Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and other scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages. However, Dr. Bokser rejects all claims that "Maimonides was an Aristotelian, an adherent of Greek philosophy," whose professions of traditionalism "were meant only to appease the orthodox" (p. 123). On the contrary, he believes that Maimonides' "primary concern was with the defense of his religious tradition" and that Maimonides rejected the Aristotelian naturalism in favor of the Jewish religion of revelation. Naturalism, ancient or modern, is sterile as an outlook on which man is to build his life in the world. Modern man, says Rabbi Bokser, should follow in Maimonides' footsteps and combine the truth of reason with the truth of revelation. "Then will man rise to his noblest destiny."

There may be reason to question the alleged orthodox Judaism of Maimonides. His understanding of God as an utterly transcendent Absolute Being seems to have little in common with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob of the Bible. However, the motive in Dr. Bokser's study is indeed noteworthy. It indicates further that modern Judaism is also reexamining the meaning of revelation.

GEORGE W. FORELL

The Faith of a Scholar. By David F. Swenson. Edited by Lillian M. Swenson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949. 160 pages. $2.50.

In this little volume some of the occasional essays and addresses of the late Prof. Swenson, translator of Kierkegaard and former head of the department of philosophy at the University of Minnesota, are conveniently made available to friends, former students, and other readers who may be attracted by one who was at once an eminent intellectual and a robust, but humble, Christian believer. The title aptly indicates the contents of this book: the faith of a scholar. This combination of faith with scholarship was precisely the value of Swenson's testimony during the lean years of the '20s and '30s.

Needless to say, Swenson's Christianity was fundamental without being "fundamentalist." He was thoroughly aware that honest and enlightened faith had to come to terms with the results of modern physics, evolutionary science, and biblical criticism—the more so because, for him, these factual issues touch the periphery, not the existential core of the religious life. "Belief," says Prof. Swenson, "is not a simple function of the intellect alone" (p. 121). "There comes a point in the scale of human decisions when these cease chiefly to be an expression of . . . the knowledge of circumstances, and become instead an expression of the quality of the personality that decides" (p. 124). "Passion rather than knowledge is the more adequate and concrete expression of the existential situation. . . . It is so with every other fundamental passion, including religion" (pp. 129, 130).

The lectures included in this volume are not all of equal value. Occasionally they do not escape the charge of triteness, though such places are preserved from banality by the author's profound ethical convictions. Those that do most justice to Swenson's status as a philosopher are "Evolution and Life Values," "Objective Uncertainty and Human Faith," and "Supernaturalism — Source of Moral Power." The reader is not disappointed in finding the Kierkegaardian flavor. "The Dignity of Life" is its "ethical responsibility." "Progress in Religious Thought" is problematical since "each generation, and each individual in each generation, is compelled to begin at essentially the same place" (p. 46). "The supposed antithesis of God and evolution is false . . . because the reflection by which the religious man refers himself to God lies in a different logical dimension from that occupied by scientific explanations" (p. 76). Since "intelligence is not absolute" (p. 89), "it cannot by itself solve the deepest and most pressing problems of life" (p. 91).

"How strange that the highest principles of the reason should appear to be beggarly articles of faith" (p. 162)!

In his Presidential Address, Swenson adumbrates a systematic epistemology along realistic lines which evidently had faced up to all the issues, though I am not aware that he developed it in detail. The author's style is generally diffuse and leisurely, though occasionally the concentrated energy of his master breaks through, as when he exclaims, "This Jerusalem of brass, of bluff and bluster, of empty pretentiousness, and of want of conscience!" (p. 138). Or, "Naturalism . . . is thus a flabbiness of spirit . . . whose assumed superiority, with which it effeminately grasps what lies nearest at hand . . . is assuredly comic." Now and then he indulges the humor of mellow wisdom and ripe years: he quotes a colleague who protested, "But, Swenson, you will never bring the American people to a consciousness of sin!" Doubtless, says our seer, "no other philosopher in America stands in need of a religion of pardon and grace," but "I do." "As a child I was told this," and "now at the age of sixty . . . I still know no better than what my mother told me." These, however, are but incidental reflections from one of the most effective essays in the book, "Supernaturalism—a Source of Moral Power." This is reprinted from his Introduction to Geismar's *Religious Thought of Soren Kirkegaard* and is a telling defense of the supernatural, a real tonic for anaemic theists.

As the editor says in her Preface, "For the sake of the history of American thought, it is not unimportant to make permanent record of the fact that in the 1920s and 1930s, when so much of the prevailing philosophy found little or no place for faith in God, . . . there was at least one thinker voicing a new, and at that time little-appreciated, philosophy that was distinctly Christian."

W. O. Doescher

The Danish-American Immigrant. Phases of his Religion and Culture. By Johannes Knudsen and Enok Mortensen. Des Moines: Grand View College, 1950. Paper, 43 pages.

The paucity of studies in English on the Lutherans of Danish extraction in America makes these little studies welcome. Knudsen's balanced account of the Danish Lutheran Church in America is informing, and Mortensen's treatment of Danish-American literature and press throws additional light on the immigrants, their problems, their religion, and their culture.

The Oxford Group: Its History and Significance. By Walter Houston Clark. New York: Bookman Associates, 1951. 268 pages. $3.50.

Among several recent studies of the Oxford Group Movement and MRA this is in some respects the most satisfactory. Frank Buchman, the origin of his ideas, and the development of his movement are presented with reasonable objectivity and with more than the customary clarity and insight. The latter half of the book, which attempts to explain the effect of the movement on its adherents, is rather less helpful. Fifty-five case histories of actual adherents are briefly summarized and are classified as negative, neutral, positive, etc. The cases clearly suggest that most Groupists quickly lose contact with the movement, even if they continue to believe that their experience in it was beneficial. The reviewer is inclined to agree with the author in his observation, "The reader who has plowed through all the varying stories of experiences with the Group may feel a little bewildered as to what conclusions to draw." It is to the author's credit that he frankly faces the limitations in a psychological analysis of his case histories. It is not unimportant, however, that his attempt should have been made.

T. G. Tappert

A Theological Word Book of the Bible. Edited by Alan Richardson. New York: Macmillan, 1951. 290 pages. $3.50.

A "Word Book" may best be reviewed by summarizing the statements of the editor in the preface. The purpose of this book is theological, i.e., "to elucidate the distinctive meanings of key-words in the Bible. Historical, geographical, archaeological, and philological details are not elaborated, except . . . in so far as they are necessary for theological understanding." Each contributor was asked to concentrate on the theological significance of the words assigned to him. Naturally, historical and philological investigations serve as a background, but such subjects are not directly included in the discussions. This principle of concentrating on the theological significance also governed the selection of words to be included. The book is not a complete vocabulary of the Bible, but contains only those words which, in the opinion of the editor, have become the key-words in Christian doctrine and theology. Such a selection is necessarily subjective, and is further narrowed by consideration of space and time. Since the book contains only 290 pages, it is evident that the articles must be short and that many words which might have a theological significance have been excluded.

The contributors to the volume are all British scholars with the exception of two from the U. S. A. There are thirty-one scholars listed, including the editor, and more than half of them are evidently Anglicans. The claim made that the book presents "a cross-section of the mind of representative English-speaking biblical scholars at the middle of the twentieth century" seems therefore a little exaggerated. Some of the best known names of biblical scholars in England at the present time do not appear in this volume. The theological position of the contributors may in general be stated as conservative; "the common point of view is that the key to the biblical revelation is Christ, who is the proper subject both of the Old and the New Testaments."

The articles, although brief, are very well written and cover the essential points of the subjects. Naturally the brevity of the discussion leaves no room for the presentation of other views than those of the author. On the more important subjects a brief bibliography is added, and within the articles frequent references are made to specific works by other scholars. The simple system of cross references enhances the value of the book as a reference work, although in one instance at least it results in a rather startling combination: Paradise, *v.* (*vide*) Hell.

This "Theological Word Book" will prove to be of great service to the pastor, the student, and any Christian who wishes to increase his knowledge of the significance of the Bible and its doctrines. Here is a great deal of information, compressed into a very compact form and readily available for use. The fact that it concentrates on the theological significance of the words of the Bible, excluding other considerations, has made it possible to limit the volume to a convenient size. For more intensive and comprehensive study the standard Bible Dictionaries and the German *Theologisches Wörterbuch* are, of course, indispensable.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM

The Physician Examines the Bible. By C. Raimer Smith. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. 394 pages. $4.25.

Mr. Smith is a general practitioner of medicine who is also an active Christian layman. This book evidently grew out of his young people's church school classes, in which he attempted to answer some of the problems arising from the Bible-science controversies. After a very brief introduction, the author discusses medical subjects in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, alcoholic liquors, faith cures, and New Testament medical references. Nearly one-third of the book is used in the next chapter to discuss and defend

the thesis that the Bible teaches "evolution." The book closes with a brief chapter on "The Temple of the Body" and a "medical concordance." Though it is good to see a layman so interested in the Bible and Christian faith, the reviewer feels that there is no excuse for the publication of this book because of the author's inadequate background in history, theology, and exegetical method.

The author's purpose and method are perhaps best illustrated by these statements: "I believe that the Bible agrees so well with the latest scientific discoveries that it will come to be more universally accepted as people learn this fact." Again, "For the benefit of humanity we should try our best to make the Bible conform to the firmly established discoveries of science, and if it can do so, then its claim to divine origin is all the more convincing." The basic assumption throughout the whole book is that Scripture is authority which must be defended and modernized in order that its ethical and moral teachings may be regarded also as authoritative. Thus, in order to uphold the authority of Scripture, Mr. Smith throws out its message. Sin becomes primarily offenses against natural laws resulting in disease. The atonement of Jesus is only an allegorical allusion derived from Leviticus. The God of the Old Testament arose by a process of evolution. The authority of the Bible seems to have no other purpose than to enforce the laws of physical, mental, and social hygiene.

The statement has recently been made that the greatest unfinished task of evangelism is the search for some way of establishing peace between our religious and scientific ways of thinking. The reviewer is profoundly in agreement with that statement, and consequently has great sympathy with the purpose which Mr. Smith attempts in his book. Mr. Smith is inadequately equipped in both fields of thinking. He is furthermore completely unaware of the fact that the real issue between the two today does not lie in the field of natural science, but rather in social science and the humanities: in sociology, psychology, history, and political science. His labor is in vain when he so valiantly defends the Bible against the natural scientists, and then accepts uncritically (unscientifically!) the position of the humanists: "As the neighbor nations moulded their gods of wood and iron, as clay is moulded by the potter, the Israelites moulded their God of ideas."

Mr. Smith is perhaps not entirely to blame for his inadequate exegesis. He doubtless learned his method by observation of pastors and church leaders who also by example teach that Scripture is primarily not a message but an authority which gives sanction to the message which the modern layman and churchman feel edifying. It should bring home again to us the fact that the real issue in Lutheran unity is not by any means the definition of inspiration, but rather the method of interpretation and the results of interpretation: "Hoc liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque. Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua!" This is Mr. Smith's view of Bible study. The reviewer would agree with Kuenen: "Intelligere scriptorem is dicendus est qui idem quod ille dum scribebat cogitavit, legens cogitat."

GEORGE E. MENDENHALL

Berkeley Version of the New Testament. By Gerrit Verkuyl. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1945. Fifth edition. 672 pages. $2.50.

Dr. Verkuyl, who once served as a New Testament fellow at Princeton Theological Seminary (a post, by the way, which is not continuous, although the title page of the work seems to suggest it) produced a translation of the New Testament in Berkeley, California, some six years ago, and this has now recently appeared in its fifth edition.

None ought to be prejudiced against new private translations of the New Testament. The author is quite right in

stating: "The language, therefore, that must serve to bring us God's thoughts and ways toward us needs to be the language in which we think and live rather than that of our ancestors who expressed themselves differently." The author has sought to render as correct a translation as possible based on the Tischendorf text, though he claims to have consulted other editions too. The preface is altogether too general to provide any clues as to his craftsmanship. The book is not only a translation but also a brief commentary with certain words and ideas explained in footnotes. But more than that, the books and the events of the New Testament are dated! With this apparatus the translation runs the risk of wearing a suit of armor.

But, turning to the chief interest at hand, what can one say about the translation itself? No exhaustive reply can be given here. A few examples, however, may be cited to show whether or not the author has attained his double objective of rendering both an accurate and a "popular" translation.

Romans 1:18, "On the other hand, God's indignation is revealed against all impiety. . . ." The vigor and the realism of Paul's thought hardly gain a true hearing. "On the other hand" is a weak representative for the Greek *gar,* and the sequence of Paul's thought in relation to the preceding thought is obscured. Then, the word "indignation" fails almost completely to give meaning to God's *orge,* wrath, anger. "Impiety" for *asebeia* hardly places the proper accent on the notion of the dynamic, irreligious practices of men in their attitude of enmity toward the Creator.

Matthew 7:27, "The rains came down, the floods rose, the winds blew and beat upon that house and it collapsed." Thus far, in language familiar to us, the translation transmits something of the life of the original, but the concluding portion, which reads, "and the wreck of it was complete," could have been rendered in the style of the preceding part something like this: And it was a total (or complete) wreck. Matthew 28:20, "And, mind you, I am alongside you all the days until the end of the age." "Alongside" hardly conveys the sense of Christ's real presence; the Greek text reads *met-'hymon,* which means "with" or "among you."

I Corinthians 1:20, "What room is there for the philosopher or for the scholar or for the investigator in secular affairs?" Here is a misleading rendition which commits at least three errors. The simple "where" for *pou* is an effective expression even today and gives Paul's own meaning accurately. "Scholar" in the modern sense of the word is quite far from Paul's mind, for he refers here to practitioners of cleverness. "Investigator in secular affairs" ignores the idea of a man-to-man verbal dispute, which is germane to Paul's argument at this point.

Mark 1:15, "The time is completed and the kingdom of God is near." "Completed" for "fulfilled" is a dangerous substitution, for this is not a question of finding a suitable word but a matter which involves one of the most essential categories of biblical thought. It would make poor sense to say *kairos* is completed, brought to a finish.

This translation may be found useful, and even suggestive, when used in conjunction with the original Greek text, but the reader needs to exercise caution. The moral of the whole matter is this: Men of the church of the open Bible! Walk in, dig!

JACOB W. HEIKKINEN

Pascal's Short Life of Christ. Translated with an Introduction by Emile Cailliet and John C. Blankenagel. Princeton: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1950. 39 pages. 75 cents.

Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), French philosopher, mathematician, and mystic, fearless Jansenist critic of Catholic Jesuit practice and teaching, believed that in

the search for true religion reason is the only instrument, divine revelation the object of reason's contemplation, and the historic life of Jesus central for the right knowledge of God. Therefore it was to him spiritually important to outline that life for the careful nourishment of his own faith. For this purpose his "Short Life of Christ" was prepared.

This brief harmony illustrates alike Pascal's high view of Scripture, which he believed must interpret itself, and the inherent strength and weakness of this approach. It shows us also the excesses of a high view of Christ, in that both in the choice of passages included and in the supplementary interpretation added by the author, the human Jesus all but disappears (cf. Sec. 49, 218, etc.). John's Gospel has a natural attraction for Pascal, the Christ-mystic. The preface of his work is thoroughly Johannine in thought and terminology, as is also the form of the harmony.

The translation is from the Vulgate text. The chronological framework and much of the interpretative comment lean heavily on the *Series vitae Jesu Christi, juxta ordinem temporum* of Jansenius (1655). There is of course no modern critical point of view here. The historical method of the writer is expressed in the words: "So holy a life . . . could be written only by the same spirit which had brought about its birth. This is why God raised up four consecrated contemporaries of our Lord who, being divinely inspired, did write the things which He said and did."

The attempt to fix exact dates and days for specific happenings, despite Ohmstead's modern concurrences, places an unjustifiable and, to most modern New Testament scholars, undesirable emphasis upon exact, detailed, literal, factual data (e.g., Sec. 2, 4, 6, 153, 162, 182, 184, 322-325, etc.). Pascal uses strong, vivid language. Jesus "sweated blood" (215), "palpated" (328); there are those who are "castrated for the kingdom of God" (134). This has made the translators careful to avoid using familiar phrases of the English Authorized Version. The work is of interest in revealing Pascal to us today, rather than in revealing the life of Jesus.

WILLIAM C. BERKEMEYER

The Babylonian Genesis. By Alexander Heidel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951. Second Edition. 153 pages. $3.50.

A second edition of this scholarly study concerning the relationship of Genesis 1 and 2 to the Babylonian (and earlier) creation stories has now appeared. As far as content is concerned, there has been very little important change in the new version. A more complete bibliography is added on page 2. An innovation, however, is an English summary, in prose, of the major Babylonian myth on pages 3-10. This will be useful to the lay reader even more than the careful translation of the text. Few changes have been made in the scholarly translation, which even Dr. Speiser characterizes as a most adequate treatment, although his own translation in Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* is more readable English. The major addition to the work is the acknowledgment on the part of the author of the recent Scandinavian and German interest in the New Year's Festival in Babylon and in Israel. Reference to this is made on pages 16 and 85 without any final commitment to the point of view. Likewise on page 135 there is evidence that the author accepts the possibility that the earlier Babylonian contacts of Israel are to be traced through that portion of Israel which did not have the Exodus tradition. (Cf. Meek, *Hebrew Origins,* and Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua,* 1950, for similar points of view.) Except for a few simple additional points to counteract the outmoded "evolutionary school" (cf. pp. 95, 99, 106, etc.), the arguments and conclusions of the first edition remain. Dr. Heidel, although recognizing influence, denies the evolutionary understanding of

borrowing on the part of the writer(s) of Genesis and maintains that such influence is consistent with the doctrine of inspiration of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.

C. UMHAU WOLF

Die gottesdienstliche Schriftlesung. Teil I: Stand und Aufgaben der Perikopenforschung. (Veröffentlichungen der Evangelischen Gesellschaft für Liturgieforschung, Heft 1.) By Gerhard Kunze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947. 224 pages. DM. 9.50.

This book, which is a comprehensive survey of the source material for the history of scripture readings or pericopes in the church, really establishes the subject as a distinct field of historical investigation that has never been fully worked and henceforth its name will be "Perikopenforschung."

The book was written during the years of the war and is a remarkable testimony to the persistency and tenacity of German evangelical theology. Reading the book one is astounded by the tremendous mass of source material that has been mastered, and it is almost incredible to learn that the work was carried on while the author was in the army. In the army of occupation in Paris he used spare time to work in the *Bibliotheque Nationale* and the *Institut Catholique;* he lugged his materials and manuscript to air raid shelters, from one station of army duty to another, and finally to the hospital from which he was finally discharged as unfit for further service. He worked with French scholars and Roman Catholic monks and called his work "a labor of peace in the midst of war service." Though the materials are massive and the study is meticulous in details, one admires the lucid, comprehensive presentation which does not allow the detail to obscure the view of the whole. Except for the researches of Rahlfs, no great studies have been made by Protestants since Ernst Ranke's, a hundred years ago, and what has been done has been done by Catholic scholars. This reviewer considers it an absolutely indispensable introduction for any worker in this field, if only for the reason that the sources are by and large inaccessible to American scholars.

Kunze begins, in proper dissertation style, with "delimitation of the problem." The scripture reading is a central element in any liturgical form or order. There must be a distinction between the pericope as a lection and as a text for preaching. This study, which is to be followed by another volume which will apply the methods and procedures here set forth to the lessons for the whole church year, is concerned only with the pericopes as lections. (A foretaste of what the second volume will contain can be gained by reading the author's articles on the propers of the church year which have been appearing in the current issues of the *Monatsschrift für Pastoraltheologie,* of which Dr. Kunze is the editor.) The aim of the study is to ascertain the origin, use, and changes undergone by particular scripture readings used in the churches; in other words, to seek answers to the following questions: Which pericopes were used in the churches? In what service and on what festivals or Sundays were they used? In which church (Eastern or Western) were they used? At what time? When were they introduced? By whom? On what liturgical and homiletical grounds? The author states that this last question is the most important and practical, but also the one to which the least scientific, historical attention has been paid. The goal is manifestly impossible of achievement, because the origin of the lections in most cases seems to antedate the documentary sources; but the study is necessary since the sources have never been studied exhaustively. Hence the second section deals with the present state of research in the field. This is divided into two parts, Eastern Churches and the Western Church, a division that runs through the whole book. This is necessitated by the subject itself but it also simplifies the mastery of the sources.

CONTRIBUTORS

Edgar S. Brown, Jr., is pastor of the Grace Lutheran Church, U.L.C.A., Pottstown, Penna.

Anton J. Fridrichsen is professor of New Testament Exegesis at Uppsala University, Sweden.

Harold J. Grimm is professor of history, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

T. A. Kantonen is professor of theology at Hamma Divinity School, U.L.C.A., Springfield, Ohio.

Hans H. Kramm is pastor of St. Mary's and Hamburg Lutheran Church, London, and a member of the Lutheran Council of Great Britain.

Carl J. Schindler is pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, U.L.C.A., Wilkes-Barre, Penna., and Protestant Chaplain at the State Hospital for the Mentally Ill at Retreat, Penna.

Robert Stevenson is assistant professor of music at the University of California, Los Angeles, Cal.

C. Umhau Wolf is professor of Old Testament at Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are Oscar W. Carlson, pastor of Ascension Church, Baltimore, Md.; George Aus, professor of Systematic Theology in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; Joseph Sittler, Jr., professor of Systematic Theology in the Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; C. G. Carlfelt, professor of Systematic Theology in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; Paul H. Buehring, professor of Church History in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus; Paul J. Hoh, professor of Practical Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; T. A. Kantonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Harold L. Creager, professor of the Old Testament in the Southern Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; Johannes Knudsen, professor of Church History in Grand View Seminary, Des Moines; A. D. Mattson, professor of Sociology and Ethics in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; George W. Forell, associate professor of Philosophy in Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; Waldemar O. Doescher, professor of Philosophy in Capital University, Columbus; Eric H. Wahlstrom, professor of the New Testament in Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; George E. Mendenhall, professor of the Old Testament in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; Jacob W. Heikkinen, associate professor of the New Testament in the Gettysburg Seminary; Carl Umhau Wolf, professor of the Old Testament in the Chicago Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; John W. Doberstein, professor of Homiletics in the Philadelphia Seminary; George R. Seltzer, professor of Liturgics in the Philadelphia Seminary.